

# ENGLISH STUDIES.

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH  
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY.

Edited by

E. KRUISINGA, P. J. H. O. SCHUT  
and  
R. W. ZANDVOORT.

1924

VOLUME SIX

≡ N<sup>os</sup> 1-6 ≡

Published by

Messrs. SWETS & ZEITLINGER, Keizersgracht, AMSTERDAM.

REPRINTED BY VRB GRONINGEN (HOLLAND)

# CONTENTS.

## ARTICLES.

Page

W. VAN DOORN, F. HOLTHAUSEN,	John Masefield, Poet . . . . .	129.
F. HOPMAN,	Studien zu den neuenglischen Mundarten. I: Yorkshire . . . . .	145.
_____,	Byron. I: Some personal characteristics . .	1.
E. KRUISINGA,	Byron. II: Some characteristics of his Poetry	49.
_____,	Contributions to English Syntax. XIII: Aspect	87.
G. LANGENFELT } H. LOGEMAN }	Contributions to English Syntax. XIV: On the origin of the anaphoric relative <i>that</i> . . .	141.
J. H. SCHUTT,	"Danskens in Paris" ( <i>Hamlet</i> , II, 1, 7) . .	12.
_____,	Beaumont and Fletcher's <i>Philaster</i> . . .	81.
M. S. SERJEANTSON,	Prof. Moulton and Shakespeare's <i>Merchant of Venice</i> . . . . .	200.
	The Dialect of the Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter . . . . .	177.

## REVIEWS.

A. BOSKER,	An Enquiry on a Psychological Basis into the Use of the Progressive Form in Late Modern English (van der Laan) . . . . .	107.
J. VAN DAM,	The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde (Ed. Schutt) . . . . .	71.
W. VAN DOORN,	Convention and 'Revolt in Poetry (Living- ston Lowes) . . . . .	69.
_____,	Walt Whitman (Hayes) . . . . .	70.
_____,	L'Oeuvre de Swinburne (de Reul) . . .	122.
_____,	The Rudiments of Criticism (Greening Lamborn) . . . . .	126.
W. F. FRIJLINCK,	De Tragedie van Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (tr. Barnouw) . . . . .	113.
F. HOLTHAUSEN,	The Place Names of Lancashire (Ekwall)	74.
J. H. KERN,	The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glos- saries (Lindsay)	
	The Corpus Glossary (Ed. Lindsay) . .	30.
J. KOOISTRA,	Shelley and the Unromantics (Campbell)	119.
_____,	De Engelsche Literatuur sinds 1880 (van Kranendonk) . . . . .	225.



A. G. VAN KRANENDONK,	Men Like Gods, (Wells) . . . . .	39.
_____ ,	Oscar Wilde, His Life and Confessions (Frank Harris) . . . . .	127.
E. KRUISINGA,	Gotisch Handboek (van Hamel) . . . . .	28.
_____ ,	The Clerkes Tale (Ed. Sisam) . . . . .	35.
_____ ,	Oor die Ontstaan van Afrikaans. (Bosman)	73.
_____ ,	An Elementary Middle English Grammar (J. & E. M. Wright) . . . . .	162.
_____ ,	Die Englische Sprachwissenschaft (Horn)	167.
W. A. OVAA,	Elizabethan Drama (Spens) . . . . .	117.
A. W. POLLARD,	Hamlet: its textual history (de Groot) . . . . .	38.
_____ ,	The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet (van Dam) . . . . .	221.
A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH,	Shelley's geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung (Spira) . . . . .	165.
R. W. ZANDVOORT,	Westeuropeesche Letterkunde I (Kalf) . . . . .	36.
_____ ,	Id. id. II. . . . .	164.
_____ ,	A Handbook of English Grammar for Belgian Students (de Vocht) . . . . .	168.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

Translations . . . . .	21, 64, 97, 154, 215.
Translation M.O. 1924 . . . . .	159.
Points of Modern English Syntax . . . . .	27, 104, 160.
Notes and News.	

G. Leopold, Robert Louis Stevenson, 60; E. Ekwall, English Studies in Sweden, 92; E. Kruisinga, A Note on the Comparison of Adjectives, 153.

English Association in Holland, 19, 61, 94, 215; *Drie Talen* Anniversary, 20; Modern Studies at Dutch Universities, 20; Dutch Studies in the University of London, 21; A Japanese Book Collector, 62; Gedenkbundel *Drie Talen* 1924, 63; Bryn Mawr Scholarship, 63; Oxford Holiday Course, 63; A-Examination 1923, 64; Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen, 95; B-Examination 1923, 95; English Studies at Utrecht, 96; English Studies at Groningen, 153; Editorial, 214.

Brief Mentions . . . . .	128, 228.
Bibliographies . . . . .	45, 75, 170, 230.



# Byron.

## I. Some personal characteristics.

If it be true, as has been asserted, that each new generation must have its own Homer translation, it may be said with greater justice that every age must appraise the great men of the past anew. For although research and criticism may have brought to light all the available evidence on which a judgment may be based, yet the appreciation of such evidence necessarily changes with the slowly evolving views and principles and ideals of mankind.

The centenary of Byron's death is at hand. He expired on the 19<sup>th</sup> of April 1824; and many writers in many lands will, no doubt, avail themselves of the occasion to formulate, perhaps to revise, their conceptions of his personal character and that of his writings.

Few figures in the history of literature have been more grossly misunderstood than Byron. The glamour of his rank and the glamour of his genius; the adulation of the women he loved and of the public bewitched by his poetry; the hatred of the women he loved no longer, of the public he outraged and of the rivals he eclipsed; the erroneous estimates of foreigners and his own wilful or unconscious misrepresentations — all this co-operated to form a distorting medium through which the real man appears as a fantastic hybrid: half superman and half demon. Generations of misguided readers have confounded the poet with the creatures of his imagination, especially with the heroes of his shorter poems. It is the man of gloom and mystery, "l'homme sombre et fatal" that took hold of the popular imagination. Their lawless and tumultuous loves, satanic pride, the rankling memory of crimes unatoned acted like a spell. The heart of the love-sick maiden went out to Harold bending wistfully over the side of his bark to gaze at the moonlight on the rippling wave of the Mediterranean. Every romantic youth was impressed by the picture of the Giaour, impenitent and sublime, spending his last years in the monastery. The wildest stories about the poet's orgies at Newstead Abbey, his intrigues and duels, his acts of diablerie and of princely munificence were circulated and credited. It was said he had taken possession of an island belonging to Greece; that he had run away with a nun. Goethe believed that he had committed a murder.

The student who wishes to understand Byron, as he really was, should clear away this tangle of prejudice and slander, of misunderstanding and romantic fancy, and turn to his letters and journals. Moore, who published fragments of the diary begun Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> 1813, says, "Employed chiefly — as such a record, from its nature, must be, — about persons still living, and occurrences still recent, it would be impossible, of course, to submit it to the public eye, without the omission of some portion of its contents, and unluckily, too, of that very portion which, from its reference to the secret pursuits and feelings of the writer, would the most lively pique and gratify the curiosity of the reader". The journal must indeed have been terribly mangled and many letters of the same period must have been suppressed by the discreet and conscientious editor. The recent publication (February 1923) of Byron's letters to Lady Melbourne (and to others), who died in 1818, throws a flood of new light on his relations with a number of



women whom it has hitherto been impossible to identify. Lady Melbourne was 62 years of age in 1812, Byron's *annus mirabilis*, when the correspondence began. "If she had been a few years younger", he wrote, "what a fool she would have made of me, had she thought it worth her while — and I should have lost a most valuable and agreeable friend".

The letters of 1812 and 1813 contain frequent references to the lady Caroline Lamb, "Medora", who succeeded the still anonymous "Thyrza" in the lengthy list of Byron's loves. She was a granddaughter to the first Earl Spencer, and married William Lamb, afterwards Lord Melbourne, in her 19th year. The poet was introduced to her in March 1812 by Rogers, and, after their meeting, she wrote in her journal, "Mad — bad — and dangerous to know". During the greater part of the year, however, he made love to her, told the story of his travels and his sorrows, and seems to have completely governed her and her household. "But after the first excitement, he began to grow weary of her talk about herself and could not praise her indifferent verses." (Nichol's *Byron*.) Lady Caroline Lamb, accompanied by her mother, Lady Bessborough ("Lady Blarney"! of the correspondence) was prudently removed, for a time, to her father's house in Ireland.

On the 10th of September Byron writes, — "Loving at all is quite out of my way; I am tired of being a fool, and when I look back on the waste of time, and the destruction of all my plans last winter by this last romance, I am — what I ought to have been long ago." Less than a fortnight later he says: "If I marry, positively it must be in three weeks; in the meantime I am falling in love as much as I can with a new Juliet who sets off for London in the long coach to-morrow to appear on (not in) Covent Garden; with an Italian songstress; with a Welsh seamstress; with my agent's wife and daughter." At the same time as "nothing but marriage and a *speedy* one" can save him from Caroline Lamb's importunities, he seriously thinks of asking "Annabella", Miss Milbanke, to be his wife. "As to *love* that is done in a week. Marriage goes on better with esteem and confidence than romance".

There is a good deal of *blague* and cynicism in the letters of this period. "As to Annabella, she requires time and all the cardinal virtues, and in the interim I am a little verging towards one who demands neither, and saves me besides the trouble of marrying, by being married already. She besides does not speak English, — and to me nothing but Italian — a great point, for from certain coincidences the very sound of that language is music to me, and she has black eyes, and not a very white skin, and reminds me of many in the Archipelago I wished to forget, and makes me forget what I ought to remember, all which are against me. I only wish she did not swallow so much supper — chicken wings, sweetbreads, custards, peaches and port wine; a woman should never be seen eating or drinking, unless it be *lobster salad* and *champagne*."

His conduct to Lady Caroline Lamb, however, was chivalrous and even kind; in spite of her vexatious and occasionally insane revenges and importunities, he remained patient and forbearing, although to Lady Melbourne he speaks his mind about her unreservedly. One of "Medora"'s childish feats was to have the words "*Ne crede Byron*" engraved on her livery buttons, "an interesting addition to the motto of my family". On one occasion she burnt Byron in effigy and all her Byronic keepsakes, with an appropriate incantation at Bocket Hall. On another, by her own confession, she forged a letter in Byron's name, whose handwriting she imitated to



perfection, to obtain his picture from Murray. After meeting him again in a London ball-room she made a scene and scratched herself with glass.

"I should esteem it as a great favour if you would once more speak to Caroline from me. Again and again I repeat that I have no wish to disturb her, nor am at all conscious of having misrepresented her, or indeed mentioned her name but to those to whom she had already committed herself. Once more I beseech her, for her own sake, to remain quiet; and having done this for the *last* time, I must add that if this is disregarded, it will be out of my *power* to prevent consequences *fatal* to her, perhaps to others also and which I most sincerely wish to avoid. She forgets that *all* does not depend on me, and she is not aware that I have done my utmost to silence some whose narratives would not be very pleasing. Remind her that the same man she is now trying by every serious and petty means to exasperate, is the same who received the warmest thanks from herself and Lady Bessborough on the occasion of her Kensington excursion (when she ran away from Melbourne House and was found and taken home by Lord Byron in August 1812), one with whose conduct she repeatedly professed herself perfectly satisfied and who did not give her up till he was assured that he was not abandoning a woman to her fate, but restoring her to her family."

While he was trying to disentangle himself out of the meshes of his first amour with a society woman, the second was in progress. A considerable number of the letters of 1812 and 1813 are dated from Eywood, Lord Oxford's place, near Presteign, and for the greater part of this time Byron was on terms of the closest intimacy with his hostess. When after a long stay at Eywood he returned to London, she broke down. "I am in some anxiety in consequence of a letter from Cheltenham this morning; *she* has burst a small blood-vessel, and is weak and ill; all which she attributes to me and my friends in town!! I presume it will end in an indisposition, which, however unpleasant for a time, would eventually be a great *relief* to both." He was now making plans and preparations for a second visit to Greece. "For a time, this plan was exchanged for the more social project of accompanying his friends, the family of Lord Oxford, to Sicily", says Moore. The relations between husband and wife appear to have been strained at this period, as was natural under the circumstances, but they were reconciled and departed without the lover. "The Devil, who ought to be civil on such occasions," Byron writes, June 21st 1813, "has at last persuaded Lord Oxford to be so too: for on *her* threatening to fill up my *carte blanche* in her own way, he quietly ate his own words and intentions, and now they are to live happy ever after and to sail in the pleasing hope of seeing or not seeing me again." Yet he undoubtedly loved Lady Oxford, as he loved all the others. A week later he says: "Lady Oxford sailed yesterday, and now, my dear Lady Melbourne, without pretending to *affect* or *effect*, will you not mention her name to me for the remainder of my weeks in England? To tell you the truth, I feel more *Carolinish* about her than I expected. They went at last so suddenly, the very day I was to have met her on the coast — all the fault of my sister's arrival." Which did not prevent him from falling in love again, some three months later, with another hostess, the Lady Frances Webster.

Of this amour we have a very full account, from the very beginning to the bitter end, in the letters written, with a most indelicate and unchivalrous lack of reticence, every two or three days to Lady Melbourne. Macaulay,



who did not admire Byron and his writings, yet owned to a liking for his correspondence. He says: "The Letters, at least those which were sent from Italy, are among the best in our language. They are less affected than those of Pope and Walpole; they have more matter in them than those of Cowper. . . . We looked with vigilance for instances of stiffness in the language and awkwardness in the transitions. We have been agreeably disappointed; and we must confess that, if the epistolary style of Lord Byron was artificial, it was a rare and admirable instance of that highest art which cannot be distinguished from nature."

The sheaf of letters referring to the Webster episode are anything but artificial. They are graphic, sprightly and unaffected, and as delightful reading as a novel, indeed, far more interesting, being authentic human documents, than any novel. They permit us, in the most literal sense of the word, to pry into the deepest recesses of the writer's mind. For this reason the reader will, it is hoped, forgive the copious quotations from this fresh material.

Byron's first impressions of his hosts, the Websters, at Aston Hall, were recorded with his usual cynical levity. "All my prospect of amusement is clouded, for Petersham sent an excuse; and there will be no one to make him (Webster) jealous of but the curate and the butler — and I have no thoughts of setting up for myself. I am not exactly cut out for the lady of the mansion; but I think a stray dandy would have a chance of preferment. She evidently expects to be attacked, and seems prepared for a brilliant defence; my character as a *roué* has gone before me, and my careless and quiet behaviour astonished her so much that I believe she began to think herself ugly, or me blind — if not worse." (Oct. 1st 1813). "She (Lady Frances) is pretty, but not surpassing — too thin, and not very animated; but good-tempered — and a something interesting enough in her manner and figure; *but I never should think of her, nor anyone else, if left to my own cogitations, as I have neither the patience nor presumption to advance till met half-way.* (The italics of his highly important confession, mine). The other two pay her ten times more attention, and, of course, are more attended to. I really believe he is bilious and suspects something extraordinary from my nonchalance; at all events, he has hit upon the wrong person. I can't help laughing to you, but he will soon make me very serious with him, and then he will come to his sense again. The oddest thing is, that he wants me to stay with him some time; which I am not much inclined to do." (Oct. 5th) Three days later he writes: "In these last few days I have had a good deal of conversation with an amiabe person. . . . I have made love, and if I am to believe *words* (for there we have hitherto stopped) it is returned. I must tell you the place of declaration, however, a billiard room. . . . We were before on very amicable terms, and I remembered being asked an odd question: how a woman who liked a man could inform him of it when he did not perceive it. I also observed that we went on with our game of billiards without *counting the hazards*; and supposed that, as mine certainly were not, the thoughts of the other party also were not exactly occupied by what was our ostensible pursuit. Not quite, though pretty well satisfied with my progress, I took a very imprudent step with pen and paper, in tender and tolerably turned *prose* periods (no poetry even when in earnest). Here were risks, certainly: first, how to convey, then how would it be received? It was received, however, and deposited not very far from the heart which I wished it to reach when, who should enter the room, but the person who ought at that moment to



have been in the Red Sea, if Satan had any civility. But *she* kept her countenance, and the paper; and I my composure as well as I could . . . . My billet prospered, it did more, it even (I am this moment interrupted by the *Marito*, and write this before him, he has brought me a political pamphlet in M.S. to decypher and applaud, I shall content myself with the last; oh, he is gone again.) my billet produced an *answer*, a very unequivocal one too, but a little too much about virtue . . . . but one generally *ends* and begins with platonism . . . . I need not say that the folly and petulance of Webster has tended to all this. If a man is not contented with a pretty woman, and not only runs after any little country girl he meets with, but absolutely boasts of it; he must not be surprised if others admire that which he knows not how to value. Besides, he literally provoked, and goaded me into it, by something not unlike bullying, *indirect* to be sure, but tolerably obvious: "he *would* do this, and he would do that," "if any man", etc., etc., and *he* thought that every woman was *his* lawful prize, nevertheless." There is a postscriptum to this letter. "This business is growing serious, and I think *Platonism* in some peril. There has been very nearly a scene, almost a *hysteric*." Two days later again Byron writes, after reverting to the scene referred to. "She says she is convinced that my own declaration was produced solely because I perceived her previous *penchant*, which by-the-bye, as I think I said to you before, I neither perceived nor expected . . . . She, however, managed to give me a note and to receive another, and a ring before Webster's face, and yet she is a thorough devotee, and takes prayers, morning and evening, besides being measured for a new Bible once a quarter. The only alarming thing is that Webster complains of her aversion from being beneficial to population and posterity. If this is an invariable maxim, I shall lose my labour." Meanwhile Byron rescues the husband out of serious scrapes and lends him £ 1000. For his lady he makes a sacrifice, too. "I must dress, and have got to *sheer* one of those precious curls on which you say I set so high a value." Soon after he elaborates a previous sketch of his hostess. "She is, you know, very handsome, and very gentle, though sometimes decisive; fearfully romantic and singularly warm in her *affection*; but I should think of a cold temperament, yet I have my doubts on that point, too; accomplished (as all decently educated women are), and clever, though her style a little too *German*; no dashing nor desperate talker, but never — and I have watched her in *mixed* conversation — saying a silly thing (*duet dialogues* in course between young and Platonic people must be varied with a little chequered absurdity); good tempered (always excepting Lady Oxford, which was, outwardly, the *best* I ever beheld), and jealous as *myself* — the *ne plus ultra* of greeneyed monstrosity; seldom abusing other people, but listening to it with great patience. These qualifications, with an unassuming and sweet voice, and very soft manner, constitute the *bust* (all I can yet pretend to model) of my present idol. You, who know me and my weaknesses so well, will not be surprised when I say that I am totally absorbed in this passion — that I am even ready to take a *flight* if necessary." There was a friend in the house, at the time, who lagonized, as Byron called it, and the husband occasionally quarrelled with his wife and her sister. On the 27<sup>th</sup> of October Byron writes: "One day, left entirely to ourselves, was nearly fatal — another such *victory*, and with Pyrrhus we were lost — it came to this. "I am entirely at your *mercy*. I own it. I give myself up to you. I am not *cold* — whatever I seem to others; but I know that I cannot bear the reflection hereafter. Do not



imagine that these are mere words. I tell you the truth — now act as you will." Was I wrong? I spared her. There was a something so very peculiar in her manner — a kind of mild decision — no scene — not even a struggle; but still I know not what, that convinced me that she was serious . . . . You ask if I am prepared to go all lengths. If you mean by all lengths anything including duel or divorce? I answer, *Yes*. I love her. If I did not, and much too, I should have been more selfish on the occasion before mentioned." The affair, mainly, it seems, owing to the lady's indecision, came to nothing.

This correspondence, which should, however, be read entirely, reveals Byron's character, as it was then, better than any other record. Dashed off, often late at night and whilst the incidents described were still hot, to a woman of the world, whom he absolutely trusted, these epistolary confidences reflect the man's inmost soul, better than his expurgated journals which were perfunctorily kept and probably with a view to eventual publication. In this episode we find back all Byron's characteristic traits — his incredible communicativeness and levity, his incontinence, his imprudence, his initial shyness and modesty — which is perhaps but the obverse of pride ("Shyness is really and truly the family appendage." "I never risk rivalry in anything.") — contrasting with his chivalrous boldness and generosity when his love had been awakened, easily overcoming his baser nature; his suspicion mastering him as soon as the beloved one was no longer present. For on his way back to London he writes. "Perhaps after all, I was her dupe — if so — I am the dupe also of the few good feelings I could ever boast of." And again: "I have brought off a variety of foolish trophies (foolish indeed without victory) such as epistles, and locketts, which look as if she were in earnest; but she would not go off *now*, nor render going off unnecessary."

After we have duly acknowledged that morality was at a low ebb during the Regency, that Byron had been cruelly disappointed by women on several occasions, that his harsh view of their nature was but reverence in disguise, and that his suspicion of their and his own motives only proved him upright at heart — still we are bound to confess that Byron profoundly misunderstood woman and woman's love. Only his bluff manliness and his chivalrous habits save him from the contempt we feel for the lives of poet-lovers like Burns and Heine, de Musset and d'Annunzio.

If Byron was famous for his love, he was not less famous for his "spleen". Spleen in the sense of a somewhat mysterious malady of the soul became the distinctive badge of imaginative people of fashion in France and Italy, after Byron's poems grew popular on the Continent. But many years before, Werther (1774) had prepared the minds of men for the new poetical melancholy, which had slumbered since the Burgundian epoch. "That nameless unrest", says Carlyle, "the blind struggle of a soul in bondage, that high, sad, longing discontent which was agitating every bosom, had driven Goethe almost to despair. All felt it: he alone could give it voice. And there lies the secret of his popularity; in his deep, susceptible heart he felt a thousand times more keenly what every one was feeling. Werther is but the cry of that dim, rooted pain under which all thoughtful men of a certain age were languishing: it paints the misery, it passionately utters the complaint, and heart and voice all over Europe loudly and at once respond to it. If Byron's life-weariness, his moody melancholy, and mad, stormful indignation, borne on the tones of a wild and quite artless melody, could pierce so deep into many a British heart, we may judge with what vehement acceptance this Werther must have been welcomed." Byron's



spleen partly explains his popularity. We should remember, however, that in his case, it was not a vague and wistful longing, an inverted home-sickness, as Walter Pater said of Coleridge. Neither had it much in common with the gloom of Chateaubriand, "*l'homme superbe et dévoré, inquiet et sombre, marqué du destin; toujours poursuivi par une malédiction mystérieuse et traînant après lui le malheur; toujours s'abîmant à la fin dans une sanglante et formidable catastrophe*" (Faguet); though it was exactly thus, as a fallen angel in duodecimo, that he liked to represent his heroes and that his admirers depicted him. He was a very handsome man. "His countenance is a thing to dream of", said honest Sir Walter and one of the women whose happiness he destroyed, exclaimed, "That pale face is my fate!" He, no doubt, tried to make himself more interesting still by looking unhappy. When Thorwaldsen had finished his bust Byron exclaimed "It is not at all like me; my expression is more unhappy." West, the artist, who painted him at Leghorn, is reported to have said: "He was a bad sitter; he assumed a countenance that did not belong to him, as though he were thinking of a frontespiece for Childe Harold." But this was transient affectation. Least of all did his dejection resemble Alfred de Vigny's philosophical despair. Byron, in spite of his cosmopolitan tendencies was an Englishman at heart. He was never at any time a thinker, an investigator of truth and his metaphysical conceptions were not logically thought out and pieced together into a reasoned system of sincere convictions. But he was petulant, gloomy and fierce; his "silent rages" are notorious. On one occasion, in a fit of anger, he threw a favourite watch in the fire and ground it to pieces with a poker. "I am never myself in a morning", he writes. But the greater part of his melancholy was assuredly brought on by lack of a definite and engrossing task that might have occupied him through life. He always felt bored and disgusted. Still he never was the neurotic and languishing bard turning away from the "stale and unprofitable" uses of the world.

The majority of his letters are rather gay than sad. He was fond of sprightly companions, and his levity and worldliness are truly surprising in a man of such surpassing genius. A letter of August 23rd, 1810, has been preserved in which Harold, of the pensive brow, describes life in the Convent at Athens where he lived. "Of this goodly company three are Catholics, and three are Greeks, which schismatics I have already set a boxing to the great amusement of the Father, who rejoices to see the Catholics conquer . . . . We have nothing but riot from noon to night. The first time I mingled with these sylphs, after about two minutes' reconnoitring, the amiable Signor Barthelemi, without any previous notice, seated himself by me, and after observing by way of compliment that my "Signoria" was the "piu bello" of his English acquaintance, saluted me on the left cheek . . . . Besides these lads, my suite, — to which I have added a Tartar and a youth to look after my two new saddle horses, — my suite, I say, are very obstreperous, and drink skinfuls of Zean wine at eight paras the olne daily. Then we have several Albanian women washing in the "giardino", whose hours of relaxation are spent in running pins into Fletcher's (his valet's) backside . . . . In short, what with the women, and the boys, and the suite, we are very disorderly. But I am vastly happy and childish, and shall have a world of anecdotes for you and the citizen." His love of mischief lasted to the end of his life. When in Greece where he was to die some months later, he rolled cannon balls about his room, to shake the rafters and to frighten Parry, the artilleryman, below with the dread of an earthquake.

Professor Nichol sums up the diversions of his youth, when he was rushing about between London, Brighton, Cambridge and Newstead, as follows — "shooting, gambling, swimming, alternately drinking deep and trying to starve himself into elegance, green room hunting, travelling with disguised companions, patronizing d'Egville the dancing-master, Grimaldi the clown, and taking lessons from Mr. Jackson, the distinguished professor of pugilism, to whom he afterwards affectionately refers as his old friend and corporeal pastor and master." Nothing can be less like the romantic ideal. Nor can it be very pleasing to readers who are only interested in the contemplative temperament, to hear that Byron, who always had a turn for affairs, at last became a very efficient man of business. His letters to Kinnaird and Hancock, to Colonel Stanhope and to Prince Mavrocordato sufficiently prove this, but the details of financial and military arrangements have ceased to be interesting to the general reader.

But when a boy and a young man Byron was as romantic as any sensitive lad. Every admirer of Ruskin remembers his passion for the "blue hills" of his youth. Byron's love of mountainous countries likewise began very early and dates from the period of his residence in the Highlands.

"The infant rapture still survived the boy,  
And Loch-na-gar with Ida look'd o'er Troy.  
Mix'd Celtic memories with the Phrygian mount,  
And Highland lanns with Castalie's clear fount."

Like many other celebrated poets he fell in love when quite a child. "I have been thinking lately a good deal of Mary Duff," he notes in his diary of 1813. "How very odd that I should have been so utterly, devotedly fond of that girl, at an age when I could neither feel passion, nor know the meaning of the word. . . . How very pretty is the perfect image of her in my memory — her brown dark hair, and hazel eyes; her very dress! I should be quite grieved to see *her now*; the reality, however beautiful, would destroy, or at least confuse, the features of the lovely Peri which then existed in her, and still lives in my imagination, at the distance of more than sixteen years." Byron was 25 years old when he wrote this. His first "dash into poetry" was as early as 1800. "It was the ebullition of a passion for my first cousin, Margaret Parker, one of the most beautiful of evanescent beings. I have long forgotten the verses, but it would be difficult for me to forget her — her dark eyes — her long eye-lashes — her completely Greek cast of face and figure! I was then about twelve — she rather older, perhaps a year. . . . I do not recollect scarcely anything equal to the *transparent* beauty of my cousin, or to the sweetness of her temper, during the short period of our intimacy. She looked as if she had been made out of a rainbow — all beauty and peace." The passionate friendships of his earlier years should also be remembered in this connection. Lord Clare was one of his idealized companions at Harrow. A few years before his death Byron wrote, "I never hear the name Clare without a beating of the heart, even now; and I write it with the feelings of 1803-4-5, *ad infinitum*." When he met him, accidentally, on the road to Imola in Italy "it annihilated for a moment all the years between the present time and the days of Harrow. It was a new and inexplicable feeling, like a rising from the grave to me. Clare too was much agitated — more in appearance than I was myself — for I could feel his heart beat to his fingers' ends, unless, indeed, it was the pulse of my own which made me think so." When he entered Cambridge he felt very lonely at first and formed a friendship with a young fellow named

Eddleston, a choir boy, and greatly his inferior in rank and talents. Moore observes, not without a spice of malice, "the disparity in their stations was by no means without its charm for Byron, as gratifying at once both his pride and good nature, and founding the tie between them on the mutually dependent relations of protection on the one side and gratitude and devotion on the other." This may be true but the worldly-wise biographer seems to have forgotten that the generous and clairvoyant friendship of which only youth is capable is unaware of distinctions of rank. Byron describes his musical protégé in a letter to Miss Pigot. "He is exactly to an hour two years younger than myself . . . . He is nearly my height, very *thin*, very fair complexion, dark eyes and light locks." Again, "His *voice* first attracted my attention, his *countenance* fixed it, and his *manners* attached me to him for ever." Moore afterwards referred to "those evenings of music and romance which he had dreamed away in the society of his adopted brother, Eddleston." There is romance too, but of a very different nature, in his trip to Brighton with a girl dressed up in boy's clothes. He introduced her when he met an acquaintance in the course of their rides, as his brother. An anecdote is told about a woman of rank, who suspected the real nature of their relationship, saying to the poet's companion: "What a pretty horse that is you are riding," upon which the "young person" answered, "Yes, it was *gave* me by my brother." Matthews tells that Newstead was entered between a bear and a wolf, amid a salvo of pistol shots. The skull cup used there, made of the cranium of some old monk dug up in the garden, has become celebrated. From his travels in the East he brought back hemlock and four skulls taken out of ancient sarcophagi. But such things are only stray bits of romanticism. Whoever studies his life carefully will find that he reserved his imaginative sensibility for poetic purposes, though at all times he was a very superstitious man with leanings towards what at present is called occultism.

It may seem wonderful, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the most celebrated English poet of his age was not a very literary man. Literature was not the material of which his thoughts were woven, it did not fill his life, he did not seriously study it. There are few references, comparatively speaking, in his letters, to books and poems and his literary criticisms were slipshod and superficial. In his later years especially he was, as has been pointed out, an extremely practical man of the world, rather coarse-grained, morose, blasé, flippant — when uninspired. He travelled like any other sight-seer. "We passed through Ghent, Antwerp, and Mechlin, and thence diverged here, having seen all the sights, pictures, docks, basins, and having climbed up steeples etc., etc. . . . ." A letter by Shelley to Byron recently published for the first time presents a striking contrast. "The Valley of the Arve gradually increases in magnificence and beauty, until, at a place called Servoz, where Mont Blanc and its connected mountains limit one side of the valley, it exceeds and renders insignificant all that I had before seen, or imagined. It is not alone that these mountains are immense in size, that their forests are of so immeasurable an extent; there is grandeur in the very shapes and colours which could not fail to impress, even on a smaller scale . . . . I shall not attempt to describe to you the scenes through which we have passed. I hope soon to see in poetry the feelings with which they will inspire you." This is what one would expect from a poetical temperament, from one whose occupation in life was poetry: who accounted to himself for his impressions, analysed, rejected, transfused them. Byron's attitude was careless and receptive; his impressions of beauty were happy accidents. In the *Swiss Journal* we find many passages which were afterwards



converted into his drama of *Manfred*. "Swiss curate's house very good indeed, — much better than most English vicarages. It is immediately opposite the torrent I spoke of. The torrent is in shape curving over the rock, like the *tail* of a white horse streaming in the wind, such as it might be conceived would be that of the "pale horse" on which Death is mounted in the *Apocalypse*." There is a significant sentence, which recurs in several letters, about his mode of composing. "I told you before that I can never *recast* anything. I am like the tiger: if I miss the first spring, I go grumbling back to my jungle again; but if I *do hit*, it is crushing." As in matters of ordinary life, so in poetry this outcast wanderer was a creature of impulse and inspiration. When the fit was on him, he transmuted all his reading and experience, even his most private domestic affliction into poetry. His poetic theory, if a batch of random prejudices may be so called, is childish. "A man's poetry," he says, "is a distinct faculty, or soul, and has no more to do with the every day individual than the Inspiration with the Pythoness when removed from her tripod." In his case this seems quite true. He sometimes wrote slightly of poetical genius, partly, perhaps, because it was not becoming in a man of his rank to write at all, and partly because he disclaimed all fellowship with authors of humble birth — unless he chanced to meet and to like them. Of certain contemporary poets he wrote: "The pity is these men never lived in *high life* nor in *solitude*; there is no medium for the knowledge of the *busy* or the *still* life." His hateful utterances about Keats were clearly inspired by his contempt for what he was pleased to call Keats' Cockney origin.

John Keats, who was killed off by one critique  
 Just as he really promised something great,  
 If not intelligible, without Greek  
 Contrived to talk about the gods of late.

(Don Juan)

Lord Byron hated vulgarity, of which he had a considerable share himself. "Vulgarity is far worse than downright blackguardism; for the latter comprehends wit, humour, and strong sense at times, while the former is a sad abortive attempt at all things, signifying nothing." On the 20<sup>th</sup> of November 1816, Shelley in a spirit of the most gentle and delicate remonstrance wrote to his brother-poet about Clare Clairmont, who gave birth to Byron's daughter on January 12<sup>th</sup> of the following year, and whom he had evidently quite neglected since she left Switzerland. "Poor Clare's time approaches, and though she continues as well as women in that situation usually are, I think her spirits begin to fail. She has lost much of the animation, and lightness which perhaps you do not ever remember in her. I shewed her your letter, which I should have withheld had I been aware of the wretched state into which it would have thrown her. I need not say that I do not doubt that you were as little aware of such an effect. But the smallest omission, or the most unpremeditated word often affects a person in a delicate state of health, or spirits. Any assurances which I could make to her of your correct intentions would be superfluous; she expresses the most unbounded confidence in you; and, as is natural, considers every imagined defect of kindness in me, as a breach of faith to you. I need not entreat you to believe that neither Mary nor myself will be deficient in every requisite attention and kindness. If you do not like to write to Clare, send me some kind message to her, which I will, to give suspicion his due, throw into the fire as a sacrifice."

If Byron replied to this letter is unknown, but after reading the next

letter in the collection (Byron to Kinnaid) the student is left wondering whether vulgarity and blackguardism were not both characteristics of this blighted soul. "Hobhouse and I have been some time in the north of Italy, and reached Venice about a fortnight ago, where I shall remain probably during the winter. It is a place which I like, and which I long anticipated that I should like — besides, I have fallen in love, and with a very pretty woman (Marianna Segati). She is married — so our arrangement was formed according to the incontinent continental system, which need not be described to you, an experienced voyager — and gifted withal with a modest self-confidence, which my bashful nature is not endowed with — but nevertheless I have got the woman — I do not very well know how, but we do exceedingly well together. She is not two-and-twenty, with great black eastern eyes, and a variety of subsidiary charms, etc."

When, after a hundred years, we try to estimate Byron as a man we shall probably either not rank him so high, or revile him as did his contemporaries. His poetry is to be dealt with in a second article; some salient traits of his character were illustrated above.

Byron's claims to greatness were of a curiously divergent nature. He was, in the first place, a poet of splendid rhetorical gifts and he often attained to the heights of what at present we consider true poetry. Though it has often been alleged that his lyrics did not express his real feelings, but were rather literary exercises to show how well he could compose and how noble and sensitive his heart was, yet after studying his journals and correspondence, no man can doubt his sincerity. Not even Goethe's poetry was more personal. But he was a creature of inspiration, a worldly, intellectual, rather eccentric Englishman of his day, frequently possessed by the "fine frenzy." He never tried to live up to any poetical ideals in real life; his life was not even permeated by poetry. Of verse as "the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science," as Wordsworth expressed it; of the poetry which is gradually assuming the functions of religion, according to Matthew Arnold — he does not appear to have had an idea. The sacredness of a poet's vocation escaped him. Serenity of mind, "bliitheness and repose" were by no means characteristic of his inner life. It has been pointed out that he might have grown sedate and serious, had he lived to old age. The remark is as futile as such idle speculations must always be. His work certainly did not improve in wisdom and purity, however much it may have progressed in boldness and knowledge of life, as he advanced in years, and his later work, like Heine's, frequently begins tenderly and beautifully, only to end with a sneer or an obscene jest. A prophet or a seer he was not, and scarcely a revolutionary in literature, even during his earliest years.

As to bodily faculties, he was a man of splendid physical vitality, free energy, elasticity. His gaiety has been noticed. His active courage, his power of enduring hardship seemed unbounded, but he lacked fortitude. His intense will was likewise a superb endowment, but he rarely persevered in any undertaking. This vigorous activity found an outlet in various exercise, swimming, riding, boxing, fencing; though he often suffered from periods of reaction, indolence and consequent gloom.

His whole life was blighted by his want of faith in the ultimate goodness of the human heart and the sacredness of human aspiration. It is very doubtful whether he regarded his work as an important or even a serious task. He often resolved to give up writing poetry. Indeed, we may ask

whether he was in earnest — in the deep sense of the word — about anything, except, perhaps, his honour. Worse men than he, by far, have occasionally rendered signal services to humanity, but the genuine leaders of the race have always been serious about what mankind holds sacred. His fatal levity and cynicism was at the bottom of all his failures and disappointments. They repelled all that the heart yearns for most. They explain his irresoluteness, his licentious adventures, his money cares, his marriage tragedy. He had no moral principles, no philosophic tenets, no fixed aim in life, no artistic or spiritual ideals, no broad basis in general theory, nothing that could make his impetuous career stable and fruitful. But he held strictly to his chivalrous code. His faculties were like an army without a general and he was at the mercy of every impulse of ambition, of lust, of pride, of vanity — also, it is true, of compassion, of kindliness, of magnanimity, of heroism.

What endeared him to great multitudes is his impetuous and world-defying wildness. There is deliverance in the sight of a man who breaks the chilling spells of conventions. The heart in bondage is filled with hope. "Whoso would be a man," said Emerson, "must be a nonconformist." Byron's manly bearing, his impatience of control, his untamed spirit, love of roving over the earth, his active hatred of cruelty, injustice and oppression was applauded by philosophers and revolutionaries and the patriots of Italy and Greece; by all young and ardent souls. The youthful Byron believed in freedom and in later years he acted up to chivalrous principles that were genuine and spontaneous feelings when he was a boy. Still he was always a conservative British peer at heart, and on scrutiny the picture of this proud and romantic deliverer loses much of its splendour.

Soon after his arrival in Greece there was some talk of offering him the crown. Given a definite task, he was eminently fit to be a leader of a semi-cultured nation. His sound common sense, and vast knowledge of practical life, his imperiousness, warlike spirit, power of endurance were superlative qualifications and these he placed ungrudgingly at the disposal of two struggling nations.

Let me conclude with a quotation from Matthew Arnold:

"We shall turn our eyes again, and to more purpose, upon this passionate and dauntless soldier of a forlorn hope, who, ignorant of the future and unconsoled by its promises, nevertheless waged against the conservation of the old impossible world so fiery battle; waged it till he fell, — waged it with such splendid and imperishable excellence of sincerity and strength."

---

F. J. HOPMAN.

## "Danskers in Paris."

(*Hamlet*, II, 1, 7.)

That Shakespeare here uses the word *Danskers* in the sense of the inhabitants of Denmark, *i.e.* Danes, is of course beyond any possible suspicion, — what there is however some reason to doubt is whether contemporary usage justified him in doing so.

My attention was called to the problem, it should even be said to the fact that there was a problem here, by a note (on p. 160) in Mr. Österberg's excellent translation of *Hamlet* into modern Danish, published by the



Gyldendal publishing house at Copenhagen in 1921. And shortly afterwards it was once more brought to my notice by the article on *Dansker* in Vol. III of the great *Ordbog over det danske sprog* (O.D.S.), that is now publishing under the auspices of "Det danske Sprog- og Literaturselskab"; in noticing this volume in the *Dutch Museum* (Dec. 1922, col. 70), I had but occasion to mention it very briefly. As both Lector Österberg's note and the quintessence of the article in the O.D.S. were founded on a paper by a young Finnish scholar, Dr. Gösta Langenfelt in the *Finsk Tidskrift för Vitterhet, Vetenskap, Konst och Politik* (utgifven af R. F. v. Willebrand, Helsingfors, Mercators Tryckeri, Januari 1920) which can surely not be thought to be generally accessible to the Anglicist readers in the Low Countries, I thought at once how I could make such of my countrymen as are interested in the matter, acquainted with the details of this interesting paper, and I was therefore happy to be brought into contact with the author<sup>1)</sup>; it would have been manifestly unfair to him to give a wider publicity to his paper, without his permission. And not only did Dr. Langenfelt at once fall in with my suggestion, but he had also the extreme courtesy to send me a copy of his recent doctoral dissertation ("Toponymics or Derivations from local names in English. Studies in word-formation and contributions to English Lexicography." Inaugural dissertation by Gösta Langenfelt . . . . . University of Upsala. Uppsala 1920, Appelbergs Boktryckeri Aktiebolag), which I had found quoted in both the Danish books mentioned. When I found, however, that in this dissertation Dr. Langenfelt had himself given a very substantial account of the matter after his Swedish paper, but like the whole of the work in English, I naturally suggested that a short review of the "Toponymics" should be substituted for my original plan of giving a short abstract only, considering that the work would soon be accessible, be it only e.g. in all University Libraries. But the author appeared to prefer a fuller reproduction of his views, "because so very few seem to read academical dissertations nowadays", and I owed it to his courtesy to comply with his wish. Accordingly I here give what is practically a translation, if here and there a free one, of his original paper "Danzig och Dansk: Ett geografiskt och filologiskt mistag", with the exception of course of such passages as cannot be supposed to interest our Anglicist readers, for example the enquiry into the origin of the name *Danzig* which the author himself suggested I should omit.<sup>2)</sup> The few additions of my own will be found marked Tr(anslator) or T(ranslator's) N(ote).

H. LOGEMAN.

\* \* \*

The N.E.D., in taking up *dansker* in the sense of *Danish*, a *Dane*, suggests that it may be a by-form of the common *danish*. A well-known Swedish Anglicist, Prof. Axel Erdmann, seems to approve of this, where he says (in a paper read at the 6th meeting of Scandinavian Philologists in 1902) that in the 16th and 17th centuries, the Danish adj. *dansk* begins to come up "and Shakespeare has at one time in his *Hamlet* (used) the

<sup>1)</sup> By Dr. Henning Söderhjelm and Hr. Redaktör Friherre Reinhold von Willebrand, both of Helsingfors.

<sup>2)</sup> It is derived, largely after G. Kossina (Ig. Forsch. 1897, 286 seq.) but with critical additions from "(sinus) Codanus" = the Belt, not, as some would think, = the Öresund. From *Codanus* we get: Codaniska (Gyddanizc), Godanisk, Gdanisk, Dansk. The ultimate etymology, i.e. older meaning of this *Codanus*, is unknown.

substantive *danskers* which was then probably a danish word, recently borrowed", — which causes Schück (Shakespeare och hans tid, II, 262) to quote this as an additional proof of Shakespeare's intimate knowledge of Denmark and his striving after local colour. Note too Sir E. Cressy's "English Constitution" (p. 57): "Kings and jarls of the Norse or *Danskermen* had sailed up the Seine."

The minor gods among the Shakespeare-commentators follow suit of course, — to quote only one: "*Danskers*, Danes; *Dansk* was the ancient name of Denmark. Sir F. Ovesbury says that the Ingrosser of Corn, hating the Danish stilyard, wishes that Danske were at the Moloccos." (John Hunter, 1869.)

Even Furnivall explains it in the same way (1870) in his edition of Andrew Boorde's "Introduction of Knowledge", 1542. Boorde depicts Denmark there as a very poor country, wanting everything and full of misery, which causes Furnivall to append this note: "For all that, in 1527 during its own period of distress, England imported wheat from Denmark among other countries", quoting Hall's Chronicle to this effect: "The gentle marchautes of the Styliard brought from Danske, Brene, Hambourough and other places, great plentie; so did other marchautes from Flaunders, Holand, and Frisland, so that wheat was better chepe in London then in all England ouer."

So far we have seen that *danskers* is supposed to mean *Danes*, which is looked upon as a loan from Danish (N.E.D., Erdmann), and secondly that *Dansk* should be the name of Denmark, of which *dansk* (adj.) and *dansker* (sb.) also could be supposed to have been derived (Furnivall, also N.E.D.).

That Dr. Murray must be quoted here as the authority for this suggestion, results from two passages in the N.E.D., one in voce *Dansk* (sb.) which is explained as 'Denmark' with a quotation from Turner's Herbal (1568): "The rootes are now condited in Danske", and a second one in v. *dansk* (adj.) with a quotation from a testament of 1569: "a danske chiste", and one from Spenser's Faerie Queene (1596): "on her head a crowne She wore, much like unto a Danisk hood", as well as one from Markham's *Masterpieces*, 1610, "Our English (Iron) is best, the Spanish next, and the Danske worst."

Starting from the supposition that Dansk must mean Denmark here, *dansk* in *danske chiste* must not necessarily be an adjective here, for it is well-known how often an Englishman uses a placename before a substantive to denote origin: *Bristol coal* (not: Bristolian), *Manchester steel* (never: Mancunian).<sup>1)</sup> As to *Danisk*, this might be a cross between *Dansk* and *Danish*.

But it will be the object of this paper to show that in all these cases *dansk* as well as *danisk* have nothing whatever to do with Denmark and the Danish form *dansk*, but that the words exclusively represent a mediæval name for the city of *Dansick* — *Danzig*.

In Schiller and Lübber's Mnd. Wörterbuch we find ample proof that this city was formerly called either *Dantzsch*, or *Danske*, *Danzke* as well as *Gdangs*. But what is of much more importance for our immediate purpose is that, as the instances there quoted<sup>2)</sup> show, these names were in use not only in the north of Germany, but also in Sweden (cf. Brieskorn's *Bidrag*

<sup>1)</sup> But as *Danske* would be the name of a country, the following may be more in point: China wares, Flanders stuffs, even Hollands, the adj. used as a sb. [T.N.]

<sup>2)</sup> Reproduced at length by our author, but omitted here. [T.N.]

till den Svenska namn-historien II, 73: un burgeys de Danske en Pruys, etc.), as well as even in Denmark.

Thus Turson in his *Vocabularius rerum* (Hafniae, 1579) gives under the *Nomina civitatum et locorum*: *Dantiscum* = *Dansken*. And Kalkar in his *Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog* (1300-1700) gives quite a host of instances from Danish sources where *Danske* clearly means *Danzig*. We even find "the Danske" used of the inhabitants of this city: "att ville bevise the tho svenske bodtzmendt, ther inde vor, then enne att boe till Dansken oc thend andenn at seigle for hyrre for the Danske" (1568), as well as the adj. *Dansker* (but in the sense of "from Dansick" of course): "iij anndre dansker furkuster" (1578), (and "andtvorede Anderss lbssen 8 daller til 1 sk. pundt dansker iern", 1608, Tr.). At the same time it should be noted that the form *dansker* is not found at all in the (modern Danish) sense of a *Dane*, *Danish*. It is therefore more than doubtful that this word *danske* should have already come into existence in Danish, at the time of Shakespeare, in that modern sense, as accepted for the current interpretation of "Danskens in Paris." In Laurentius Andræ's Swedish translation of the New Testament (1526), there occur the following folk-names in the nominative plural: *the lubske* (those from Lübeck), *the romerske*; in the genitive plural: *the lübskers*, *the romerskers* (Acts of the Ap. 25, 16). Such archaic terms as "nu komma de svenske" have been copied c. 1500. Before this time *dansker* in the sense of a Dane does not seem to have been in use in Denmark, hardly even in the plural application of *Danes*. The suffix-*er* must have been added later on.

Now, from Kalkar's dictionary we see that *Danzig* produces a sort of chests that are also called "prys(k) kiste", also iron, as well as a sort of cloth ("10 dyner of bred Danskerdug") and ale: "X pridske tönner danstz öll, (viij pridske fad dantstz öl, 1530, Tr.). We shall presently see that just the same articles come from what in our English sources is called *Danske*.

A closer examination of these sources will therefore bring us a good deal further. The "Inventories and testaments" (Surtees Society's publications no. 2) contain *inter alia*: a *dannc coffer* (p. 223), *two Danske chistes*, 1567 (p. 250), a *dance chiste* (variants: *danske*, *dansk*, pp. 257, 309, 337), and: *two tone of danske iron*, — *one tone of englishe Iron* (p. 338), — *dansk yron* (p. 364). In another testament, of 1561, (published by the Surtees Society Publ. no. 121, p. 33) we find a *French hode* and a *French crowne*, which we may compare with Spenser's *Danisk hode*, for this can hardly have been anything else but the unique headgear which was introduced from *Danzig* (i.e. Poland) into England, where it spread and got well-known. And as we can make it clear by an example that *Danisk* occurs in English in the sense of *Danzig* (cf. Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle, Surtees Society, 101, p. 251: Julie 5th, 1635, Roger Simpsonn to receive noe benefit by this company in the Daniska") it follows almost with certainty that Spenser in the passage quoted really thought of the well-known splendid Polish female headdress. (Compare a form *Damske* quoted elsewhere, which may well stand for *Daniske*.)

This beautiful head-gear is described at length by Fynes Morison (upon whom it clearly has made a very profound impression) in his *Itinerary* (1617, ed. 1908, IV, 207); we may add that the city of *Danzig* is always called *Dantzke* there, never *Danzick*.

But we must continue the enumeration: (ib.) 1592, *one Danske cheste* (p. 151); *two Daunske pottes with covers with my armes*. Similarly in Surtees Soc. Publ. no. 38, a *danske chiste*, 1580 (p. 20); VI *Danske dayles* (1582),



p. 69; *Dansk potts, a howle Dansk chiste* etc. etc. (pp. 94, 113, 123). In the publications of the Camden Society, 82: Lists of Foreign and Alien Subjects, 1618 (p. 77), we find: "*in Dansk under K.P.*", (King of Poland).<sup>1)</sup>

Special attention should be called to one quotation from the Surtees Society papers just mentioned (no. 38): *Two Spruce dales; a Hambroughe barrel; XII lbs. of Skeene thread* (p. 121), because it bears out very clearly what was said just now about *Dansk* having to be looked upon as after all a substantive rather than an adjective. — *Hamburg barrel, Skeene threads* contain of course substantives only.

The remarkable popularity of these Danzig-articles will be found illustrated in the following quotations from inventories, deeds of purchase, mortgage bonds, testaments, etc., which will no doubt seem conclusive:

Surtees Soc. Publ. 2 (Inventories and Wills and Testaments): *sexe danske pootts of powther*, p. 413; *two danske chysts* (p. 435); in the collection of deeds quoted before (Surtees Soc. Publ. no. 38, Wills) we find: *a Danske chiste* 1586 (p. 139); *Danske pottes*; *I Danske cheist*, *V Danske cheistes*, *II Danske pottes* (p. 155); *I cradell of Normandeye glass . . . . . XXVII Spruce dailes*; *CC Norwaie dailes* (p. 158); *one Danske coffer*, *one lardge Danske chiste with insett work*, (6 times); *Danske potts*; *Danske iren* (p. 178); *a Danske chiste* (pp. 1:3, 195), etc. etc.; *Danske pottell pottes* (= glass jars?); p. 231: *a Danske hatchett*; p. 252 etc. *towe Dance chistes*; p. 263: *in the loweste lofte one hundredthe nynty and one fadys*; or *bundels of lynt, beinge III Danske lastes . . . . Halfe a Danske laste of hempe, with roppes and canvesses . . . . CIIII ends of Danske iron*; p. 267 (1596 7): *VI Dainsicke buckettes*; p. 299: *V lastes Danske lynte*; p. 303: *IIII Danske chestes*. *Dainsick* would seem the englishing of the undoubtedly German form *Dantzig*, a sort of transliteration which seems to have made its appearance in English about 1600. In *Walsingham's Journal*, 1573, (Camden Soc. Publ. 104) we even find the form *Danswicke* (compare *Brunswick*<sup>2)</sup>): *certain letires unto her Majestie from Danswicke*. We shall presently find how all these older forms, inclusive of the usual *dansk(e)*, are gradually replaced by the victorious genuinely German *Danzig*, or else *Dantsic*.

One more quotation from the Surtees Soc. Publications (no. 93, 1564, p. 71): *shall be mayd onely of flaxe called spruce or danske flaxe* — calls for comparison with another extract (ib. 2, 1446, p. 93): *una mensa de*

<sup>1)</sup> My readers may feel some doubt about this expansion of "K.P." The quotation as thus expanded is in itself of much greater importance than any of the preceding one, for it cannot *per se* be called more than exceedingly probable that *dansk* must be looked upon as = of *Dansick*, in consequence of the coincidence quoted as to the same wares coming from this 'Danske' and from other German countries, not from Denmark. It may therefore be worth while to add a quotation from *Notes and Queries*, Ser. 12, vol. 11, Oct. 28, 1922, p. 349: "Abraham van Bennick, borne in Danske under the King of Polande." As the King of Poland is not known ever to have possessed Denmark ("under"), this quotation would seem conclusive. No source given; *Danske* is there recognised to mean *Danzig*.

In Wolff, *Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (New York, 1912), p. 442, Mr. Zandvoort found the following quotation in a summary of William Warner's *Tale of Argentile and Curan in Albion's England* (1586) Bk. IV, ch. 20: "But Curan, "sonne unto a prince in Danske", has fallen in love..." etc.

Only the full context which neither Mr. Zandvoort nor the present writer can look up, would give absolute certainty as to *Danske* here referring to *Danzig*, and not to Denmark; the matter will therefore have to be investigated before any conclusion can be drawn from this form, which if = Denmark would be very interesting. [T.N.]

<sup>2)</sup> Both englished, it would seem, by a sort of attraction under English *wick* (Hampton Wick, Berwick, etc.) the rarer form of *-wich*, as in *Harwich*, etc. [T.N.]

*Prusia . . . una larga cista de opere Flaundrensi.* This is one of the many cases where Danzig and Prussia are found side by side to indicate practically the same place of origin. In another will, of 1531 (E. E. T. S. nos. 125, 128, p. 37) we find side by side: "item, a dobell cownter, of damske (read: danske), a sprewse chest." We have already noticed in Brieskorn's collection how Danzig (Dansk) is often explicitly located in Prussia (Pruys). In English, this double indication is preserved, but in the course of time *Dansk* was gradually applied more especially to chests, jars, etc., whereas *Pruce*, *Prucia*, *Spruce*, etc. got used in connection with tables, ale, etc. In the N. E. D. we shall find, in v. *Pruce*, a long list of examples most of which bear out this statement: 1390 *I tabula commensali de Prucia*; 1462 *mensa de prewse*; 1495 *unam cistam de Pruce*; 1463 *the prews coffre*; 1478 *I pruce tabyll*; 1480 *I pruce ches*; 1576 *pruce byer*; 1760-'72 *turned into pruche or spruss beer*. See also the N. E. D. under *spruce*, a remarkable by-form of *pruce*, which is also found in connection with wares from Danzig: 1497 *spruce bordes*; 1545 *sprewce canuas*; 1656 *Spruce Canvas*; 1461, 1540 *spruse chest*; 1445, 1522 *spru(s)se coffre*; 1489, 1523; *spruce compter (countre)*; 1614, 1626 *spruce deales*.

It should be remarked in connection with this *deale* (also *dail* and other spellings) that Kalkar in his Middle Danish Dict. mentions a "Danmarks dæl", which is described as "a sort of plank", with a reference from 1586 *attj wille forschaffe oss aff wort riige Norge three hundrit thylter gode Danmarkis deeler*. *Deel* is of course the same word as German *Diele* and Swedish *tilja*; the Danish *deel* would seem inexplicable, unless we think of a loan from English (or Dutch? T.). I have not succeeded in finding any case where 'Denmark' stands for Dansk, *Pruce* or *Spruce*; it will however hardly appear too bold to maintain that the expression "Danske dailes" as such has been borrowed from English, and was transformed then quite naturally of course to "Danmarks deeler." My notes show that the English also spoke of "Norwaies dailes" as opposed to "Spruce dailes". Denmark is not known ever to have exported timber.

It would hardly be worth while to reproduce all the examples of the N.E.D.; they will prove on investigation that *Spruce* is usually associated with timber (cf. *spruce-tree* for a *pine-tree*), with leather, with colours (cf. *Prussian blue* with *spruce ochre*) and with beer (cf. Pickwick Papers XX: "Printed cards, bearing reference to Devonshire cyder and Dantzic spruce"). But while *dansk* is not found before the names of these articles (with the exception of timber), we meet with *spruce* as well as *dansk* before *table*, *chest*, *box* and *jar*.

\* \* \*

One is now inclined to ask: How is it that the English had such strong interests in the Baltic? [The author's answer to this question will have to be reproduced here in extract only. It comes to this that the power of the Hansa would not, on investigation, seem to be so absolute as is usually supposed. Tr.] The transactions of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, e. g., yield ample proof that they did a good deal of trade in what was called Eastland, — possibly Esthland, but practically identical with what the Swedes call Österland, i. e. the Orient. They had important factories, among other places, at Dantzic.

Significantly enough, Danzig has two suburbs called respectively *Alt-Schotland* and *Neu-Schotland*, — which is in itself enough to point to Scottish influence; it may be mentioned in this connection that e. g. Imma-



nuel Kant was of Scottish origin. And the following extracts from the accounts of these Merchant Adventurers should speak for themselves.

In 1622 "a committee at Dansk" is mentioned (Surtees Soc. Publ. 101, p. 141), but at p. 143: we shall apply ourselves to the Committee you have settled at *Dansicke* for the two sums expended at *Dansicke* and London; p. 144: of the committee you settled at *Dansicke* . . . for that one Walker, a Scot, carryed thether above 200 halfe cloathes, beside kersyes in one Megg, a dansker; p. 147: to give a Cocquet for Cloath and Lead entered for *Dansicke* by a brother of your company; p. 142: expended by the ffactors at *Danske*; p. 150: by the Factors at *Dantzike*; p. 157: to the several factoryes of *Dantsick*, *Quinsbr.* and *Riga*; p. 154: our trade and impositions from *Dansk*, *Queensbrough* (= *Königsberg*)<sup>1)</sup> and *Riga*; p. 173: the Skotts marchant of *Danske* shipte heer to *Danske* this sommer. (1564).

Anyone more especially interested in the *realia* — i.e. not only the *Wörter* but also the *Sachen*, in short: in the economical aspects of the case, will find a good deal to interest him in Hirsch's *Danzig's Handels- und Gewerbsgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1858), where the English influence will be found to have been not unimportant. In 1422, e.g., the town of Danzig took very energetic measures against "die zu einer festen Niederlassung in Danzig vereinigten Englischen Kaufleute" (p. 56). As early as 1370-1386 four Englishmen had become Citizens of Danzig (ib., p. 98), etc. etc.

In 1629 the new form *Dansickers* is found, perhaps before, but references are wanting. "The treaty betweene the King of Swede and the *Dansickers*". (Camden Society Publ. N. S. pp. 45, 66).

\* \* \*

The present investigation may no doubt be supposed to have shown that nothing but a downright mistake lies at the bottom of the contention that *Dansk* should at that time have meant either *Danish* or *Denmark*. No doubt when Laertes is asked by Polonius to "enquire . . . what *Danskens* are in Paris", Shakespeare means "what *Danes*", but the passage is another proof, by the side of the shores of Bohemia, that the author's geographical knowledge left a good deal to be desired, — although of course he did not stand alone there. The versatile Andrew Boorde whom we have just quoted says in one place (E. E. T. S. Extra Series X, p. 163): "In Denmark, their mony is gold and alkemy (= tin), and brass . . . . In gold they have crownes; & al other good gold doth go there. In alkemy and bras they have *Danske* whyten." Another case of a stay-at-home's ignorance, — there can hardly be any doubt that Boorde, having heard *Dansk* wheat referred to, has connected the word with Denmark, just as Shakespeare and so many others had done.

One more conclusive quotation may close this survey. In *Recorde, Grounde of Artes*, fo. 159, we read about *Dansk* money. "They have their Grasshe where of 30 make 1 gilderne, which is worthe 4 shillings sterlings, and they have also dollars olde and newe, their common dollars some are woorth 24 grassche, some 26 and some 30". Usually we have a short *o* in English loanwords, answering to an original *a*: *frock* from *fracke*, *dollar* from *daler*, etc; here the reverse process would seem to have taken place; *grasshe* from *groschen*. In the same way Morison (l.c. II, p. 131) has: "And at

<sup>1)</sup> Dr. Langenfeld does not explain this equation. [T.N.]

Dantzke the same Merchant for the same fifty dollars gave me one and thirty Hungarian dackets of gold, and fourteen *grash* in silver".

To conclude then: *Dansk*<sup>1)</sup> in older English literature must have meant Dantzig, and *Dansker* an inhabitant of that place. True, this *Dansk* did not lie "at the Moloccos" as Sir F. Ovebury wished, but all the same a little farther away than the Rev. J. Hunter believed.<sup>2)</sup>

H. L.

G. LANGENFELT.

## Notes and News.

**English Association in Holland.** During the second half of January Mr. Sydney Carroll, late of the Sunday Times, addressed the branches of the English Association and of the 'Genootschap Nederland-Engeland' at Dordrecht, Nijmegen, Haarlem, Amsterdam, Hilversum, Enschede, Utrecht, Arnhem, The Hague and Groningen, on *Contemporary English Drama*.

In the week ending February 23, Mr. Arthur Stratton, who lectured in November last on *Tudor Architecture and later developments*, will repeat this lecture at Leiden, Rotterdam, Dordrecht, Utrecht and Groningen.

In March, Mr. John A. Stelling was to have given a second series of Dickens recitals. A few days ago, however, news was received of his sudden death. He will be remembered in this country for his quaint, lovable personality, his wonderful gift of memory, and the entertaining way in which he rendered episodes from the works of his favourite author.

If time permits, another series of lectures will be substituted, in which case members will be notified by their branch committees in the usual way.

<sup>1)</sup> In the feudal castles of East-Prussia and Kurland, as Dr. Kurt Meyer tells me (Johanniter-Krankenhaus, Szittkehmen, East-Prussia), the privy appears to have been designated by the name of *Danske*, explained by him as a hit at the Dantzig-merchants who used to oppose the princes and landgraves and had to defend their city against them. [The semasiology of the case would seem to require further elucidation T.]

<sup>2)</sup> Of Dr. Langenfelt's enquiry into the history of *dansk* and its English equivalents: *danish* etc., as well as kindred remarks which he has added by way of appendix, I can only find room for a suggestion, reproduced from Zachrisson (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, 1911) that modern *Dane* may be a subtraction-form of a Norman-French singular *Daneys*, also found written *Danes*. Dr. L. calls also attention to a not very common "The Denmarkys" (quoted from Wyntoun VI, 1559), to which he compares such a formation as "The Lancashires" = Lancashire regiments. And without entering at all into this subject, he just touches upon a somewhat distantly related discussion, also from Hamlet, that has recently been broached, whether possibly in the well-known "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark", these last three words might stand, not for the land of Denmark as it is universally interpreted, but for: The (mental) condition of (Prince) Hamlet."

In the author's dissertation "Toponymics", as quoted *supra*, we find one additional quotation worth reproducing here, from Drayton's Polyolbion (1612, II, p. 73), where *Dansk* would seem to be used in the sense of Denmark (or Jutland):

"These noble Saxons . . . who under Hengist first and Horsa, their brave chiefs, from Germany arrived . . . (were) forc'd to seeke a soil wherein themselves to seat. Then at the last on Dansk their ling'ring fortune drave, where Holst unto their troops sufficient harbour gave." [T. N.]



**DRIE TALEN Anniversary.** The January number of *De Drie Talen* is the first instalment of the fortieth volume. To publish a periodical of this kind for forty years, without any change of publisher or editor except those necessitated by deaths is a success to which we know no parallel in our country. And it is a still more wonderful circumstance that one of the original editors is still doing his work with the same zest and capacity that has given such a reputation to the part for which he is specially responsible: the fortieth anniversary of the periodical coincides with the fortieth year of Mr. Eykman's editorship.

The editors and the publisher have decided to commemorate the event by the publication of a Miscellany to which many older and some younger students of modern languages have contributed articles of varying length. At the time of writing, the book has not yet appeared, although it will be sent to subscribers in the course of this month (January). It is with great pleasure that we note among the contributors scholars representing the scientific as well as the practical study of languages, professors and other scholars as well as schoolmasters. It is a sign that the study of foreign languages in Holland is in the hands of men of the world, who know that the University needs the elementary and secondary school as much as the elementary and secondary school need the University. For this reason we, too, rejoice in the success of a periodical that has had a considerable share in raising the teaching of foreign languages in Holland to its present high level, and express the hope that it may long continue its useful career.

---

**Modern Studies at Dutch Universities.** In November of last year Dr. H. W. Rutgers opened his course in Modern German at Groningen University with a lecture entitled *Der Unterricht in der Neuhochdeutschen Sprache an der Universität*.<sup>1)</sup> The speaker expressed his satisfaction that modern languages, after a discussion of forty years, have at last been recognized as subjects which it is not below the dignity of a Dutch university to hold examinations in. We should have preferred if he had expressed his sense of the scandalous spectacle of a government pretending to give opportunities of training, and asking a big sum for it, while withholding from the university the means of carrying out its duties towards its alumni. But we understand that a young man may think it the duty of those who are older than himself to criticize the official representatives of State education. — Dr. Rutgers says a few words as to the possibility of learning a foreign language at a university. It seems to us that the answer depends rather on the teacher than on the place of teaching. It need not be explained here that it is absurd that the university undertakes to provide diplomas without a teacher who is responsible for the subjects examined. As to the place of the living language in a University, Mr. Rutgers holds that the aim must be entirely practical. The scientific training must be the task of the teacher charged with the history of the language. We are afraid that the study of modern languages will not be benefited by the changes introduced in the university regulations, even if and when carried out with a due sense of their real importance, unless university teachers are really convinced that the practical study of a modern language should be accompanied by a thorough scientific study of the present stage of the language, because such

---

<sup>1)</sup> Wolters, f 0.75.

a study is absolutely necessary to make the historical studies of real use. Mr. Rutgers repeatedly declares that he is thoroughly orthodox; the study of the history of language must complete the practical study. It is a pity that he does not seem to grasp the importance of the idea that has been advocated by the greatest representatives of language-study: that the modern language is even more important to the historical student. We recommend the study of Delbrück's little book on the *Grundlagen der neuhochdeutschen Satzlehre*, a book that is no doubt known to him, but whose importance does not seem to be fully understood by him, as by many others. — For the rest we are pleased to find ourselves in agreement with most of what Mr. Rutgers says.<sup>1)</sup> One point may be specially mentioned; the speaker warns against the tendency of undervaluing the importance of reading against studying handbooks. If he can teach students to learn their idiom, their synonyms, and also much of their grammar, by a careful study of German texts, he will do them a great service. It is a lesson that most students find it very hard to learn.

---

**Dutch Studies in the University of London.** It is probably known to most of our readers that the University of London, some five years ago, organized a Department for Dutch Studies. Dr. P. Geyl, at that time the London correspondent of the *Nieuwe Rotterdammer*, was appointed to the Chair, and some time afterwards Dr. P. Harting was appointed as his assistant. We learn that the University has made a new arrangement. Professor Geyl is now specially charged with the study of Dutch history, whereas Dr. Harting will be responsible for Dutch language and literature. We hope that the new arrangement, which makes the two men independent heads of practically two different departments, and takes account of the special field of study cultivated by each of them, will prove beneficial to the development of Dutch studies in England.

---

## Translation.

1. Wiegen lay down at full length on the knoll and forgetful of all earthly things let his large and dreamy eyes roam over the country around him, the blue sky and clouds as they came and went. 2. On the knoll where he lay stood two or three birch trees. 3. The thick, crooked trunks rose glistening white with black patches; the branches were white and glistening up to the top where they changed into brown and broke into a hundred thin fine hanging stems, which gave to the trees the appearance of weeping birches. 4. Gay colours prevailed in trunks and leaves, delicate, green leaves which were always stirring, never at rest, talking and whispering about the thousand things happening on the moor which the birches alone can know.

5. "Oh! go on talking and whispering, for I know all about it," thought Wiegen. 6. Did you imagine I did not know that the rabbits were here quite early this morning, and that they played about till the two big bucks bit each other, while the does sat by the side? 7. And that all at once

---

<sup>1)</sup> E.g. when he stresses the importance for modern studies of a *thorough* knowledge of classical languages.



the whole troop scuttled off head over heels to their burrows because the hawk came swooping down from overhead? 8. I say, what did the hawk tell you that I do not know? 9. I know it all and that he perched on a branch, looking far across the hills at the marsh, and that you dared not say a word then."

10. And Wiegen, lying at full length, kept gazing up at the tree top where the twigs laughed and nodded at him.

11. "But I know something that you do not," he continued pensively; "it is true you can look far across the moor because you are so big and tall, but you can't move from your places; you must for ever remain here, you will never get any further. 12. You can't reach the ducks in the morning when they swim and dive and skim over the water. 13. I was there early this morning, they were sitting on the bank; and they stuck their bills in between their feathers and under their wings, they wanted to make them oily and clean, the dead feathers they took out, they had no use for them and dropped them on the ground; the whole bank is still full of them. 14. And you did not see what I did, you lie-abeds! 15. They did not know I was coming for I can steal along noiselessly on my bare feet in face of the wind, and I had told Sipie to keep quiet and with a stone I hit one full on its head: look, here it is, dead; do you want to see it?"

16. And he raised himself up from his recumbent position and drew the duck, the big and shining one, from the bag beside him. 17. "Do you see it up there?" he said. 18. "No, Sipie, let go, be off!" 19. For the dog already naded the feathers between his teeth. 20. "Look, it has a red bill and its feathers are blue and white, it is a drake; and do you feel the thickness of the greyish-brown feathers on its breast? 21. Wine shall have him when she comes!" 22. And at the same time he put the bird back into the bag. 23. The village policeman might be sneaking about in the neighbourhood. 24. But his conversation with the birches was finished for the present. 25. For, sitting up straight, he fixed his eyes on the far horizon over the low range of hills; and he gazed behind him in the other direction; you never could tell, that policeman had such a stealthy way of creeping about.

**Observations.** 1. *Wiegen stretched himself at full length on the hill.* — *In his full length and as long as he was* are literal renderings of the Dutch. — *Forgetting about all earthly things.* — *The country around him* is correct. The various senses of *land* and *country* are treated exhaustively in Günther's *English Synonyms*. Pacing up and down this walk, while her eyes wandered over the still green country. (Lucas Malet, *Mrs. Lorimer*, Chapter III, p. 29.). — *Come and go*: to watch the soft shadows come and go upon the ceiling as the sun came out or went behind a cloud. (Samuel Butler, *The Way of All Flesh*, Chapter LXXX p. 363.)

2. *Two or three birches were standing.* The periphrastic form should not be used when the verb expresses a permanent state. Compare: He was *lying* on the sofa — Rotterdam *lies* on the Maas; The boy was *standing* on his head — The house *stood* in a fine situation. *There stood.* *There* is not necessary: On the table stood a tea kettle (Gaboriau, *The Clique of Gold*, p. 10.). — *Where he was lying* is correct. — *Birch tree*: The *birch trees* were all gold among the rocks of the knoll; a roving buck rabbit came to the foot of it. (*Windsor Magazine*, Sept. 1911. p. 476).

3. *Knarled* is obsolete; the modern form is *gnarled*. Many an acorn sown by the autumnal wind which wafted Caesar to the coast, may have become the 'unwedgeable and *gnarled* oak' long before the final retirement

of his successors. (Thomas Milner, *The History of England* Ch. IV. p. 30.). — A *stem* differs from a *trunk* in being slender. — *Gleaming white* is good English. For the difference between *gleam*, *shine*, *glitter* etc. Günther may be consulted. The statue of Hercules was back upon its pedestal again . . . the *gleaming white* arm was uplifted under the rays of the electric light. (*Windsor Magazine*, July 1908, p. 204.). His eyes were fixed upon the stark, *gleaming* body, coming out more and more steadily till two-thirds of it rested on the slimy bank (*Ib.*, p. 202). "See what a glass of good wine can do! Why, your eyes are *shining* already!" Poor fellow! his large eyes *gleamed* rather than *shone*; for the effect of wine on his excitable brain was not more powerful than instantaneous (E. A. Poe, *Hop-Frog*). Children's hands and men's dark clothes soil table-cloth edges — this is where wear first shows. P. and G. removes this 'edge-soil', saves linen and keeps it *gleaming white*. (Advertisement.). His face *shone* with perspiration (*Windsor Mag.* 1909). A face which *shone* with soap. (*Pearson's Magazine*, July 1910. p. 102.). Something *shines* in the grass. A knife! (T. Hopkins, *The Romance of Fraud*, p. 54.). His eyes *twinkled* (humorously) but also *glittered* (with avarice). (Hornung, *Raffles*, p. 35.). From the whitewashed ceiling depended a T-shaped gasfitting, one burner of which showed a *glimmer*. (A. Bennett, *Anna of the Five Towns*). Nor did this *glimmer* of a quenched fire seem to light him to a quicker sense of his debasement (Dickens, *The Chimes*.) A lantern *glimmer*. (Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I. p. 109.). Humorously *twinkling* eyes. (*Strand Magazine*, Sept. 1909, p. 282.). A funny *twinkle* that made him peculiarly adaptable for his part of clown. (*Windsor Magazine*, March 1905. p. 552.). — *They branched out into*.

4. A cheerful tone prevailed in trunks and foliage. — Subtle leaves. In the sense of 'slender', 'thin' the word *subtle* is marked obsolete in N.E.D. — *Hung* still is right. *Hung* quietly must be condemned because we can substitute the preterite of the copula for *hung*. It would be an impropriety to write: The clouds look *darkly*, the poor child looks *coldly*. But the adverb should be used as soon as the adjunct qualifies no longer the noun but the verb: He looked *coldly* on me. See Onions' *Advanced Syntax*, § 24. — *Rustled* would refer to sound rather than to motion. — *Which always stirred*. See Kruisinga's *Handbook*, § 265 & § 266 and compare Sweet *N.E.G.* § 2221. — Both on the *heath* and in the *heath*: Remaining on the *heath* (Hardy, *Return*, I 181.). Should be so easily worked upon by a girl in a *heath*. (*Ib.*, p. 231.).

5. Yes, talk away. "Grin away", said Sikes, replacing the poker and surveying him with savage contempt. (Dickens, *Oliver Twist*, Ch. XV.). Yes, darling, ask away (*Pearson's Magazine*, June 1909. p. 608.). — *Wiegen* thought.

6. *Het* as a provisional object anticipating an infinitive or clause is often left untranslated. Ik weet het wel, dat hij me bedriegt. Here *het* is a mere expletive. See Kruisinga's *Grammar and Idiom*, § 84. — *The rabbits sat (have sat) here*. The preterite seems more appropriate because it expresses a past occurrence without any reference to the present, laying more emphasis on the action than on its result. — *Ram* is not said of a male rabbit. *Buck* may also be applied to a male hare: Hares are usually solitary, but in early spring, when they pair, several may be seen playing about together, even by day — the proverbial madness of the "March hare." The *bucks* fight savagely together . . . . the *doe* usually produces five young. (Frank Finn, *The Wild Beasts of the World*, II p. 2.). — *While the does sat by the side*. *Sit* may have the same meaning as *sit down*: The hurrying crowd smooths its caudal plumage as it *sits*. (Holmes, *Addr. opening Fifth Avenue Theatre*



100. quoted from N. E. D.) When she could stand the crick in her neck no longer she *sat* upright again (Mrs. Sidgwick, *Lamorna*). Here the addition of *down* would be impossible.

7. *Dived into their holes.* *Dive* is often used in the sense of 'dart out of sight,' 'disappear': He *dived* into the coffeeroom. (E. M. Forster, *Howard's End*, p. 208.). He *dived* into his bedroom. (Leys, *Houseboat Mystery*, p. 75.). — The hen-raven began it by tweaking the cat's tail and *scuttling* for dear life from the slashing paw that followed (F. St. Mars, *Kafoozalum*.). A rabbit pricked up its ears, stared for an instant and then *scuttled* to cover. (J. D. Beresford, *A World of Women*, p. 150.). Causing the conceited hares to *scuttle* away for the hills (R. L. Surtees, *Ask Mama XXXI*. 74.). — *Swoop (down)*: In olden times an eagle *swooped down* upon the New England coast, and carried off an infant Indian in his talons. (H. Melville, *Moby Dick*, Ch. XIV. p. 84.). The roar of the engine swelled to a terrifying violence, so close, it seemed to *swoop upon* us (*Strand Magazine*, Dec. 1921. p. 562.). *Fly down*: The raven *flew down* to a river to drink. (St. Mars, *Kafoozalum*). The wonder-bird, who was watching from above, *flew down* to meet the sorrow-stricken chieftain with the boy in his hold. (*Children's Encyclopaedia*, p. 902.). *Pounce* suggests the idea of catching the prey: The insect was *pounced upon* by one of the great black-and-white hornets, as a hawk *pounces upon* a rabbit. (G. D. Roberts, *The Black Swamp*.). — *From overhead*: There was a quick run of reports, half heard in that devastating roar, *from overhead* (*Strand Magazine*, Dec. 1921. p. 562.). The thunder roared and rattled *overhead*. (Conan Doyle, *The Surgeon of Gaster Fell*.). A hideous yellow fog *overhead*, blurring every outline. (*Strand Magazine*, Aug. 1906. p. 223.). In a different sense: If they bathed, they never were to go *overhead*, unless they liked it. (Stead, *The Jolly Family at the Seaside*, p. 24.). *From on high*. He does not deal in wicked arts, he is inspired *from on high* (*Strand Magazine*, April 1914. p. 427.).

8. *Say* is an Americanism, British usage requiring *I say*.

9. The hawk made off, striving to gain a tree-top where she might *perch*. (*Windsor Mag.*, Aug. 1916. p. 312.). This rook was *perched* in a tree. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, June 1899. p. 445.). A robin *perched* upon a bare bough was wistfully watching old Quercy, who was digging in his garden (*Strand Mag.*, April 1914. p. 473.). On descending at daybreak into her kitchen the dame would descry the cat *perched* on the dresser. (Bulwer Lytton, *Eugene Aram*, p. 92.). Old castles, *perched* like eagles' nests among the mountains (Irving, *Sketchbook*.). — *Swamp — Bog — Marsh*. A swamp differs from a *bog* and a *marsh* in producing trees and shrubs, while the latter produce only herbage, plants and mosses (*Webster*.). In dark fens of the Dismal Swamp The hunted Negro lay. (Longfellow.). Near the top of a steep and rocky knoll at the heart of a cedar *swamp* a mother lynx had her lair. (*Windsor Magazine*, Sept. 1911. p. 472.). A mangrove *swamp* was successfully evaded. (*Royal Magazine*, Oct. 1913. p. 568.). A spacious patch of *morass*, fairly firm on the surface, but underneath, a slough of viscid mud. (G. D. Roberts, *The Black Swamp*.).

10. *Where the twigs made fun of him.*

11. *You can't from your place.* Verbs of motion were often omitted in the early stages of English, just as they are still occasionally left out in present-day Dutch. Shakespeare has many examples of this practice: I must to Coventry. (*Richard II*.). Instances are sometimes found in modern English literature where the Elizabethan idiom is deliberately introduced for quaintness. Let's to table. Are you for London? See Onions, *Advanced Syntax*, p. 5. —

The word *place* ought to have been pluralized as it refers to each tree. Compare: The porter shut the door in our faces. They have broken their hearts (*Ships that Pass in the Night*). They took their leave(s). See Günther, *Manual* § 381. Roorda (*Dutch and English Compared* § 32) observes that the rule does not always hold good in the case of words that do not generally form a plural: We held our breath(s). — *You must always and always remain here.* — *You never get further.* The present tense should not be used in headclauses to refer to something future. See Kruisinga, *Handbook*, § 96 & § 140.

12. *You can't get to the ducks.* — *Come at the ducks* has a different meaning from that required in the text: Chickens . . . if only he could come at them! (*Windsor Magazine*, January 1910. p. 316.). *Skim the surface of the water* is correct. Wild fowl *skim the surface* of the water (J. Butler, *New-Zealand*, I. 27.). Caused his head to *skim along* the ice (*Strand Magazine*, April 1914. p. 425.).

13. *Stuck the beaks* should be *their beaks*. The possessive pronoun is the rule when the possessor is the subject of an active sentence: Het paard legde de ooren plat = laid back *its* ears. (Kruisinga, *Grammar and Idiom*, § 24 ff.). *Bill* would seem the more appropriate term in the light of Günther's remarks (*Synonyms*): The neb of a bird is called a *beak* (sometimes also *bill*) when it is very strong, pointed and adapted for striking, tearing to pieces, and pecking (birds of prey); when it is flattened, rounded, and weak it is always called *bill* (pigeons, ducks, geese). The word *duckbill* (vogelbekdier) seems to confirm this statement. But the curious bird *Balaeniceps*, which is remarkable for its enormous beak is popularly known by the name of both *shoebill* and *shoebeak*. — *Wanted to make them greasy.* He lugged out a *greasy* notebook (Wells, *Tono Bungay*). "Whose plate-powder do you use?" asked Helga, still busy with the *greasy* forks and spoons. (Mrs. Sidgwick, *The Lanternbearers*, p. 243.). I saw a great yellow face, coarse-grained and *greasy*, with heavy double chin (Conan Doyle, *Adventure of Dying Detective*). A *greasy* cloth cap (*Strand Mag.*, Aug. 1912. p. 4.). A *greasy-pole* competition [mastklimmen] (*Wide World Mag.*, Aug. 1911. p. 442.). — *They let them fall on the ground* is good English.

14. *Sleepy-heads* does not convey the same idea as *lie-abeds*. A *sleepy-head* is merely a sleepy or lethargic person (N.E.D.) = Du. slaapkop. — *You have not seen it what I have done.* The preterite is preferable. Het should not be translated. See Note 6.

15. *Against the wind* is right. He was skating in face of the wind: he had his fur collar turned up, his cap pulled low (Marjory Bowen, *The Confession of Floris Heenvliet*). — *Full* in the sense of *exactly, just*: Kissed her *full* on the mouth. (E. Wallace, *The Clue of the Twisted Candle*, p. 119.). He was pointing the muzzle *full* at the queen. (*Strand Mag.*, March 1903. p. 347.).

16. *From his prostrate position* is correct. — Sam and Peter woke up and, raising themselves in bed, looked at the dog. (W. W. Jacobs, *The Understudy*). — *Sack*. The definition in N.E.D. runs: A large bag oblong in shape and open at one end, usually made of coarse flax or hemp, used for the storing and conveyance of corn, flour, fruit, potatoes, wood, coal etc.

17. *Up there*: Fred came to the foot of the tree. "You, *up there*," he said, "come along down." (P. G. Wodehouse, *The Mixer*.).

18. *No, Sipie, leave it alone.*

21. *Wine will have it* would express a mere future; the speaker expresses his determination. She *shall* have the money, whether she likes it or not.



(*Little Lord Fauntleroy*.) "You shall be of the party" he promised. (Oppenheim, Aaron Rodd, p. 67.).

23. *It might be that the village policeman was prowling about.* Farmer Basset was always *prowling about* with an ash-plant (*Strand Magazine*, Nov. 1911. p. 578.).

24. *For the present.*

25. As I watched him [i.e. a burglar] *creep about* the room it suddenly came to me that here was a chance of doing him a good turn (*Strand Mag.*, Nov. 1915. p. 522.).

Good translations were received from Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss L. M. H., Santpoort; Mr. J. H., Bergum; Miss B. J. v. K., Delft; Mr. A. T. de M., Amsterdam; Sister Ph., Oirschot; Miss H. W. S., Rotterdam; Miss T., Hilversum; Miss J. v. d. V., Leeuwarden; Mr. J. V., Tuindorp; Mr. K. de V., Dokkum.

To lessen the interval between the setting of a new passage and the appearance of the translation and notes, the latter will in future be published in the number next following, instead of in the next number but one as has been done hitherto. For the convenience of new subscribers, the passage set in December is here reprinted. Translations may be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 94 Voorstraat, Brielle, up to February 20. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

1. Eindelijk mocht Ida dan uitgaan en werd, goed ingepakt, door Juf vergezeld op een korte wandeling voor haar gezondheid. 2. Het was niet erg prettig, maar de lucht was frisch en de verandering was wel aangenaam voor haar, ofschoon de straat niet zoo vroolijk bleek te zijn als ze vanuit het raam van de kinderkamer geschenen had. 3. 's Avonds werd Ida bij haar oom geroepen. 4. Ze was sedert ze ziek geworden was niet beneden geweest. 5. De gesprekken met den terughoudenden ouden heer waren altijd vormelijk en onbehaaglijk, waaraan Ida met een gevoel van verlichting ontsnapte en daar ze dien avond nog zwak van haar ziekte was, steeg haar zenuwachtigheid bijna tot angst. 6. Juf deed haar best om haar moed in te spreken: het was waar, Ida's oom was nu niet zoo'n opgewekte heer, maar denk eens aan dat lekkere toetje! 7. Wat kon een nette jonge juffrouw meer verlangen dan haar beste jurk te dragen en in de eetkamer studentenhaber te eten alsof ze de vrouw des huizes was? 8. „Toch vind ik het jammer voor het kind”, vertrouwde Juf de oude knecht toe, nadat ze Ida bij haar oom gebracht had, „want zijn uiterlijk zou een groot mensch schrik aanjagen, laat staan een kind. 9. En ga jij nu straks eens naar binnen, als je een excuus kunt bedenken, en laat haar een opgewekt gezicht zien, dan doe je een goed werk”. 10. Maar vóór de goedgehartige bediende een aannemelijk voorwendsel kon vinden om de eetkamer binnen te gaan, en Ida bemoeidigend toe kon lachen van achter zijn meester's stoel, was Ida weer in de kinderkamer terug.

11. Ze had heusch getracht zich aardig voor te doen. 12. Ze had een onberispelijke nijging gemaakt bij de deur — zoo zwak als ze was — ze had heel waardig haar plaats aan het hoofd van de tafel ingenomen, en had vrij netjes geantwoord op haar oom's vragen naar haar gezondheid, en, verlangend het gesprek aan den gang te houden, hem verteld, dat de heg knoppen kreeg. 13. „Wat is er met de heg?” had hij tamelijk bits gevraagd: en toen Ida haar lentenieuws herhaalde, scheen hij niet veel belangstelling te toonen. 14. Het hoorde niet tot het werk van den tuinman. 15. Ida zweeg verder maar en haar oom eveneens. 16. Hij had scherpe oogen en borstelige wenkbrauwen, van waaronder hij Ida vorschend op kon nemen, op een manier, die al haar tegenwoordigheid van geest deed verdwijnen. 17. Juist dezen avond vond zij zijn oogen meer op zich gericht dan anders.

## Points of Modern English Syntax.

91. It would be such a pleasant surprise to his sister to see her little daughter bringing home her long lost sailor uncle. Mary Lamb in *Selected Short Stories*, Second Series.

What is the relation of *sailor* and *uncle*? Handbk. 1746.

92. The office was not at its normal. Bennett, *Roll-Call*, Part I, ch. 6, 3.

Explain the use of *normal*. Handbk. 1774; compare ib. 1792.

93. For well or ill we have a Parliamentary system. *Observer*. 5/2, 1922.

What is unusual in the use of these adjectives as nouns? Handbk. 1770.  
Explain the absence of the article. Handbk. 1775.

94. And it's not want of memory; for I declare I can see him this moment. Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll*, ed. Schutt, p. 13.

What is the function of the common case in *this moment*? It should have been mentioned in Handbk. 1857.

95. They kissed, and she shut her eyes. Bennett, *Roll-Call*, Part I, ch. 3, 3.

Discuss the voice of *kissed*. Handbk. 1872.

96. I had gone to bed Henry Jekyll, I had awakened Edward Hyde. Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll*, ed. Schutt, p. 113.

What part of the sentence is *Henry Jekyll*? Handbk. 1884.

97. Why she thought of him thus suddenly she had no idea. Galsworthy, *Freelands*, ch. 8 p. 98.

What sort of clause is this? Handbk. 1915 and 1925.

98. How I could be any comfort to my father, struck me with wonder. Mary Lamb in *Sel. Stories*, Sec. Ser. p. 4.

Is this a subject- or an object-clause? Handbk. 1915.

99. The news which one day reached Gabriel, that Bathsheba Everdene had left the neighbourhood, had an influence upon him. . . . Hardy, *Far From the Madding Crowd*, ch. 5.

What sort of sentence is introduced by *that* here? Handbk. 1925.

100. Architecture, for instance, could not exist without engineering, which tells the architect what he may venture to do and what he may not. *Times Lit. Suppl.*, 2/11, 1922.

Does *which* introduce a continuative or a restrictive clause? Handbk. 1929.

101. Throughout these changes Sophy had been treated like the child she was in nature though not in years. Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*.

What is the rule for using the clause *she was* etc. without any connecting word? Handbk. 1933.

102. He grew resolute. On the day of the party at the Benbows he had been and carefully inspected the plot of land at Shawport, and yesterday he had made a very low offer for it. Bennett, *These Twain*, I, ch. 6.

Is this sentence an example of three coordinated sentences? Handbk. 1977.

103. If in this matter Mr. Belloc's book is disappointing, it is equally unsatisfactory in regard to another and even more important matter. *Times Lit. Suppl.* 30/3, 1922.

Does *if* introduce a conditional clause? Handbk. 1988.

104. He knew nothing of their history, and wished to know nothing. Bennett, *Clayhanger* II, ch. 10.

Discuss this use of *nothing*. Handbk. 2024.

105. As no man of seven could reach the upper shelves, a pair of steps was provided for Darius, and up these he had to scamper. Bennett, *Clayhanger*, I, ch. 4.

Explain the concord of *a pair of steps* with the verb and *these*. Handbk. 2042.



106. Good-bye, Mr. Derek. 'Tis quiet enough here now; there's changes. Galsworthy *Freelands*, ch. 38.  
 Explain *is* with the plural *changes*. Handbk. 2049.
107. Wedda, therefore, walked alone; but at her side went always an invisible companion. Galsworthy, *Freelands*, ch. 14.  
 Explain the place of *went*. Handbk. 2076.
108. (He) considered himself a hardened sort of brute, free of illusions. Bennett, *Clayhanger*, I ch. 1.  
 To what word is *hardened* an adjunct? Handbk. 2096.
109. Well, Mr. Utterson, you are a hard man to satisfy, but I'll do it yet. Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll*, ed. Schutt p. 71.  
 What is the function of *to satisfy*? Handbk. 2101.
110. There is only one wish realisable on the earth; only one thing that can be perfectly attained: Death. Stevenson, *Virginibus puerisque*.  
 Account for the place of *realisable*. Handbk. 2122.

## Reviews.

*Gotisch Handboek* door DR. A. G. VAN HAMEL. Haarlem. H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon. 1923. 258 pp. Cloth F. 9.00.

For more than forty years Gothic<sup>1)</sup> has been an examination subject in our universities, and in the examinations for the B-diploma. There seems hardly room for doubt, therefore, as to the desirability of an introduction to the study of Gothic that is specially adapted to the needs of Dutch students. And Dr. Van Hamel, who has himself been through the university mill, has a thorough understanding of what these needs are. The result is that he has written a book that will probably drive all foreign handbooks out of the Dutch market.

The book is arranged in twelve chapters. After a short introduction on the history of the Gots and the provenance of our Gothic texts, there follow two chapters of a practical character on *Sounds and Symbols* and on *Accent* i. e. the rules of stress. The two next chapters, which conclude the first part, on Phonology, deal with the vowels and consonants from a historical point of view. In this part the author wisely restricts himself to languages that are known to most of his readers: Latin, Greek, and occasionally Sanskrit. In the second part, dealing with Accidence, the arrangement is somewhat different, the history of the forms being relegated to footnotes. The third and fourth parts deal, very briefly, with Word-formation and Syntax. An appendix provides specimens: selections from the four Gospels and a few pages from one of the Epistles and Skeireins, 30 pages in all. Finally there is a Glossary.

The mere enumeration of the contents will have shown that there is offered us here a book that provides everything that our students require. It has the additional advantage of taking more notice of the work of Dutch

<sup>1)</sup> The usual spelling in English books is still *Gothic*, although everybody knows that it is due to a mistake. The share that English scholars have taken in the study of *Gotic* is certainly no reason for following them in this conservatism. Besides, *Gotic* is no innovation, but rather a restoration: King Alfred and his contemporaries invariably use the form with a *t*: *Gota*, pl. *Gotan*.

scholars than foreign handbooks are apt to do; there are several references to articles that on account of the language in which they are written or of the periodical in which they appeared run a risk of being ignored by foreigners. The author also seems to expect that the Dutch character of his work will be emphasized by the use of Dutch instead of the international German terms. Perhaps, however, he only does it in order to fall in with the terminology of his master, Professor R. C. Boer, the General Editor of the series of *Oudgermaansche Handboeken*, of which the present book forms the third volume.<sup>1)</sup> In any case, the proceeding seems to us a mistake. By using *klankwisseling* for *ablaut*, *klankwijziging* for *umlaut*, we may hide or obscure the fact that the most important contribution to the progress of linguistic studies in the last hundred years has been made by German scholars: the fact remains the same. And for those who do not like the German pre-eminence there is only one way to destroy it: by producing work that is equal to the German work, both in quality, and, what may be even more difficult, in quantity. Consistency, moreover, would require the removal of all the Latin terms which remind us that it is through the intermediary of Latin civilization that we have learned the use of the terms of Alexandrine scholars.

Those who remember the complaints of the style of German books will ask if in this respect, too, the present book is an advance. I think that the answer of an unprejudiced reader of German scholarly books must be that the present book is very like them, not bad, not good if we compare a work like Meillet's *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*. Dr. Van Hamel's style strikes me as curiously old-fashioned, and I am all the more inclined to believe that there is something in this impression, because the author's views on the development of speech are certainly often rather those of the eighteenth than of the present century. This shows itself most clearly in the part dealing with sounds. On p. 24 he declares of Wulfila: "Lange en korte vocalen onderscheidt hij acoustisch niet". Of course the author means to say that Wulfila did not in his spelling distinguish length of vowels. But this is not an isolated instance, and sometimes it seems evident that it is not a question of style but insufficient knowledge of phonetics that has caused the statement to be untenable; thus on p. 78 he actually instances the introduction of the consonant of the plural preterite into the singular by *sloeg* from *sloegen*, as well as *vroor* from *vroren*. Several phonetic distinctions are as little intelligible as those of the early phoneticians recently discussed by Eykman in the *Nieuwe Taalgids*. When speaking of Indogermanic stops, he illustrates the palatals by means of English *keen* and *geese*. It is natural that the author's views on Gothic pronunciation are not quite satisfactory. Apart from details<sup>2)</sup>, the fundamental mistake is that he is practically unaware of the uncertainty that the reconstruction of a dead language must entail. He is even quite confident when explaining prehistoric sound-changes: on p. 151 he explains that the *p* of *kunpa* must be due to the participle *kunps*. The same remark might be made with respect to the discussion of *ablaut* (p. 61 f.). In the vexed question of the *ai* and *au* in words like *saian* and *staua* the author sides with Braune, but he explains *ai* in the reduplication as long æ as well. I cannot pretend that I understand all his arguments, and prefer Kluge's view: *non liquet*.

I am afraid my conclusion must be that the author is a 'paper phonetician',

<sup>1)</sup> The first volume, *Oergermaansch Handboek* by Prof. Dr. R. C. Boer, was reviewed in E. S. I, 2, 25 ff. (April 1919).

<sup>2)</sup> For these there is no room in a periodical dealing with English.



to use Sweet's expression. And for this reason it seems extraordinary that he should speak of Sievers and his intonation-theory in a manner that is to me insufficiently respectful. When he finds comfort in the thought that most people in Holland will agree with him, I must say that a scholar should be the first to advocate plural voting, in matters of scholarship; and if it be urged that Sievers would be in a minority even if he got 100 votes to one for every Dutch scholar, the question would still remain to be answered if the arrangement would be fair.... to Sievers. Do I advocate the introduction of Sievers's results into a book of this sort? No, we must leave it to time to decide what is to be permanent in Sievers's results. In the mean time there can be no harm if young beginners learn that among scholars, too, there are unapproachable Olympians.

In the chapter on Accidence I noted the definition of an aorist-present as a present with the vowel that belonged 'properly' to the aorist. The question is, no doubt, difficult; but if it is mentioned at all, it seems to me that it should be explained less mechanically. Perhaps the Greek verbs that have a different stem for the present and the aorist, like ἔραω, εἶδον, would be helpful in realizing a stage when Indogermanic had not yet any tenses, but distinguished aspect only. The chapter on syntax is short; the writer declares that it is exclusively meant to serve a practical purpose. But as Gothic is not studied for its own sake, and is always the introduction to the study of some other Germanic language, it would have been useful and practical if syntax had been treated a little more fully. The study of the use of the definite article in Gothic makes it easy for the student of Old English to see in what respects its use has increased. The treatment of the optative in Gothic explains the use in Present English. I believe that the author here, as elsewhere, shows that he is not really a student of any living language.

The texts are not accompanied by the Greek original; this would have been a great boon to those students who know Greek; it would have been useful, too, for those who study Gothic without knowing Greek: it would remind them that no independent study of Gothic is possible without some knowledge of Greek. The addition of the original would also have shown that the heading of the Gospels as on p. 200: *aiwaggeljo pairh Marku anastodeip* is a rendering of the Latin *incipit*, so that Wulfila may have used a copy with the Latin and the Greek text in parallel columns.

The get-up of the book is admirable, and worthy of the firm that publishes the series. The photographic reproduction of a page of the Codex Argenteus is welcome, but only a facsimile would have given an idea of the beauty of the manuscript. We may hope that a second edition will give an opportunity for this improvement.

E. KRUISINGA.

---

*The Corpus, Epinal, Erfurt and Leyden Glossaries.* By W. M. LINDSAY. (Publications of the Philological Society VIII). Oxford University Press, 1921. 15/—.

*The Corpus Glossary* edited by W. M. LINDSAY. With an Anglo-Saxon Index by HELEN MCM. BUCKHURST. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 40/—.

In 1890 our countryman Dr. J. H. Hessels published an edition of the Corpus Glossary, which not only contained an accurate reprint of the MS., but also corrected a great many of its corrupt readings. It did not, however,

fall within the scope of that edition to mention the texts or the collections from which the glosses had come and although in the mean time many of these were traced to their origin, by the investigations of Gruber, Goetz, Schlutter, Napier, Glogger, Hessels and others, the want of a book in which everything was collected that was known about them remained to be felt. Professor Lindsay, the famous Scottish Latinist, who was eminently qualified for supplying this want, has done so in the second of the books under discussion, which is meant to be a companion-volume to Dr. Hessels' previous edition, and together with it has published a separate volume to serve the purpose of Prolegomena. He here shows how the Corpus Glossary came into existence and sketches its relation to other early English glossaries, the more primitively arranged Epinal and Erfurt and the still ruder collection known as the Leyden Glossary. In this collection the items are arranged, not in alphabetical order, but mostly in sections according to the writings to which they refer, a favourable circumstance that enabled Prof. Glogger and Dr. Hessels to point out, in the majority of cases, the passages in which the lemmata occur. Now Prof. Lindsay made two important discoveries, firstly, that in Epinal and Erfurt (which are arranged partly in simple alphabetical order, partly in AB-order) in several instances the batches of Phocas-glosses, etc. may still be recognised and that the same is to some extent possible in Corpus (arranged in AB-order throughout), and secondly, that the compilers of Epinal, Erfurt and Corpus availed themselves of existing Continental glossaries, notably Abstrusa and Abolita, of which MSS. have been edited by Goetz in his *Corpus Glossarum Latinarum*. He further detected that the Leyden Glossary contains glosses from a source of the Hermeneumata type, batches of which glosses proved again to be still discernible in the more perfect glossaries. The way in which all those glosses were incorporated in the Corpus Glossary is described in full in the first book mentioned above, where it is also shown that other sources, such as Aldhelm, were freely used in the making of it.

Consequently Prof. Lindsay has been able to bring out an edition of Corpus that labels the bulk of its Latin and Greek glosses and many of the Old English ones, though it stands to reason that the assignment of glosses to such sources as Abstrusa or Abolita cannot in itself rank in importance with their ascription to a definite passage in Latin literature. For the Old English glosses he had the invaluable help of the late Dr. Henry Bradley and of Mr. W. H. Stevenson and could derive much benefit from the discoveries of the late Prof. Napier and of Prof. Schlutter, while as to the Latin glosses it was especially Gruber's, Goetz' and Hessels' previous work in this quarter that had paved the way.

In abundant footnotes and copious elaborate notes at the end of the volume the author gives a host of information about the various items, though something is left to be done, especially for a great many Old English glosses (often appearing in clusters), whose sources have even now remained obscure or doubtful, as Prof. Lindsay can often only point out a possible source (*Cp. Ep. Erf. Leyd. Gl.*, p. 105 sqq.).

The editing of the Corpus Glossary has been done in this way that the glosses have been punctuated more consistently than is done in the MS. and when necessary have been corrected by bracketing superfluous or missing letters and words, while the source or possible source, if found, has been added after the glosses. Some of the author's silent changes, I must confess, seem to me quite unnecessary, viz. the distinction between *i* and *j*, *u* and *v* and the exclusive use of *ae* for *ae*, *æ* and *ē*. In school-



books it may be helpful, though not perhaps wise, to print *aljecit* or *avus* instead of *abiecit* or *auus*, but what is the good of such spellings in a book meant for scholars? A mistake like *Uiscellum* for *Iuscellum* (U 208) is made less obvious by printing *Viscellum* instead. Moreover in quoting from the Epinal Glossary it would have been better to use Prof. Schlutter's facsimile than Dr. Sweet's, which is manifestly less reliable.

In the matter of the elucidation of the Old English glosses, which here concern us most of all, the progress is less than in the case of the Latin ones. We are thankful, it is true, to get rid of such ghostwords as *maffa* O 166 (v. *Cp. Ep. Erf. Leyd. Gl.*, p. 47), or to learn that *faertyhted* C 471 does not bear on the lemma Clinici, but translates Latin illectus; that meadro, the lemma to *bordan* M 155a, stands for Maeandro; that Suffocacium S 698 is probably a kind of cake (Bradley), hence is rightly glossed *cecil* = *cēcil* (which Ferdinand Dieter identified with *coecil* = *cācil* as early as 1885); that the lemma to *agnidine* D 78 was originally Detrita (ablative); that *Exilia gesticcum* E 421 may be a mistake for *Exugia gescincium*, and that *aac* C 648 is a gloss to Rubor (mistaken for Robur), not to Color; but on the other hand we cannot help perceiving that the author is less familiar with Old English than we might desire. A few instances will show this. For the gloss Accintu *denette*. A 172 someone (was it Schlutter?) has ingeniously suggested Acanthus *blinde netle*, which seems possible, as Acanthus denotes a foreign plant and so may well have been glossed by a native plant name, although *blindnetele*, *blinde netele* as a rule translates *archangelica*, which may be either the yellow weasel-snout, or archangel (*Galeobdolon luteum*, or *Lamium Galeobdolon*), or some kind of dead-nettle. Lindsay, leaving *denette* as it is and comparing *Acanthum: semen urticae* in another glossary, alters Accintu into Acanthum and in this manner makes it more difficult to understand the Old English gloss. — In *gebinumini*, the gloss to Ademto A 206, *ge* is cancelled, but it is far more probable that the gloss is a double one meant for *ge-*, *binumini*, as it corresponds to both adepto *ginumini* and adepta *binumni* in Epinal (and similarly in Erfurt). To Antulus, *caecbora*. A 659 there is a note (p. 194) that shows Prof. Lindsay to have misunderstood the Old English word, which is identical with *cēacbora*. The Index hesitatingly identifies it with *cāgbora*; but of course *caec-* = *cēac-* has just as little to do with 'key' as with 'keg' (suggested by the editor) and 'jug-' or 'vessel-bearer' is the correct equivalent of the Latin. — E 328 *Euiscerata. athed*. The gloss Sub.iugatis. *gededum* should have retained the editor from altering *athed* (= *ādēd*) into *athied*, which, besides, is a form not to be expected in Corpus. — *quidam* from Epinal (*Cp. Ep. Erf. Leyd. Gl.* p. 4, 13 and p. 6, 1) ought to be *quida*; the MS. has *quida* with a long horizontal stroke crossing the *d*. — The etymology given of *frysca* B 227, as if derived from *frosc* (but Corp. has *forsc*), is purely fantastical. — Ludarius L 298 is considered as possibly a mistake for *Lucar*, *lucaris* and its gloss *stēor* as possibly = Germ. *steuer* 'tax'. But O.E. *stēor* never has that meaning and in derived glossaries the item correctly occurs among the names of bovines or at any rate of animals, with the lemma *Laudaris* or *Ludares*. — The so-called O.E. *lopostum* S 174 instead of Vulgar Lat. *lopostris* is due to an oversight on Dr. Hessels' part; the MS. seems to have *lopost* (or *lopost?*), s. Glogger, *Leid. Gloss.*, III a, p. 51.

Many of Bradley's suggestions mentioned in the footnotes or the Index are specious rather than probable, e.g. the following. For *Adplaudat. onhliorrouuit*. he would read *Adplicauit: on hlior rouuit* 'rows to shelter',

but what form may \**hlion* be? — His change of *cli* into *oli* (!) 'oil' (p. 271) in C 974 Cyprinus. *forneted cli*. does not take us any nearer to the explanation of this mysterious item (Ep. *fornaetichli*, Erf. *fornetiali*). — In l 474 Iota. *sochtha*. (Ep. *iota sochtha*, Erf. *iota sochtha*) the gloss is explained as a mistake for *se ehtotha* 'the eighth letter', but apart from the fact that such a gloss to *iota* (in the well-known passage of the Gospel of S. Matthew) would be unintelligible and that the reading of the earlier MS. (Epinal) is graphically farther away from Br.'s conjecture, *iota* happens to be the ninth letter of the Greek alphabet, not the eighth. — Bradley's explanation of *cearricge* S 277 as a derivative from *cirran* with the suffix *-icge* does not take into account either *cear ruccae* Ep., *cearricae* Erf., or the lemma Senon; no translation is vouchsafed. — Quite impossible is his guess (known before from Toller's *Supplement*, p. 141) that *suacenic* P 203, which glosses *percommoda* (for -do), stands for *sua cenlic* = *swā cynlic*. 1<sup>o</sup>. this would not be a translation of *percommodo* (the passage is : *e mollissimis stratis cubiculogque percommodo matutinus egrediens* Oros. IV, praef. 7), 2<sup>o</sup>. not *sua* is the word used in Corp. Gl. but *suae*, 3<sup>o</sup>. the mutation of *u* never appears as *e* in Corp. Gl. (nor, for that matter, in Epinal), 4<sup>o</sup>. the *d* in Ep. Erf. *suacendlic* is not accounted for. Latin *per-* suggests that the gloss originally consisted of the adverb *suīde* and an adjective ending in *-lic*, but I cannot think of an adjective meaning 'comfortable' that is graphically nearer to the MS. reading than *getāslīc* or *zehyðlic*, neither of them satisfactory. — Instead of *gierende* T 41 Bradley proposes *giernde*, "from *geornan* 'desire'" (p. 276), but leaving aside the *ie*, what connexion is there between 'desire' and the lemma *Taxauerat* 'had esteemed'? — The translation of *gronwisc* A 160, 'moustached fish' (p. 277), is wrongly fathered on Bradley, s. Köhler, *Die ae. Fischnamen*, p. 39 sq. In my opinion, both *u* in the Corpus gloss and *w* in *gronwisc* Wr.-Wülck. 344, 39 preclude the possibility of a compound of *fisc* being meant.

However, these are minor blemishes, not even all of them due to Prof. Lindsay, who may be said to have achieved his principal aim of publishing a sound critical edition of the Glossary containing all the available matter for the elucidation of the Latin glosses, and of giving a wonderfully clear insight into the way in which the composition of the Glossary was accomplished.

It is a great pity that an equal praise cannot be bestowed upon the endeavours of the lady who has composed the 'Anglo-Saxon Index'. It is only fair to take it at its own valuation of being meant 'to enable a reader ignorant of Anglo-saxon to know the meaning of the words and to find them in Bosworth and Toller's Dictionary (last edition<sup>1</sup>) and Supplement,' but the Index does not even come up to this moderate requirement. The best that may be said of it is that its quotations seem to be accurate, for the rest it is composed negligently and unsatisfactorily. If the *Dictionary* has the wrong form of a word and the *Supplement* the correct one the Index is sure to give the former; the meaning of words is not always added, even in cases where there is no difficulty, such as *bune* 'cup', *cīan* 'gills'; mistakes, grammatical and other, are frequent, wrong quantities abound. Some instances may illustrate this. The gloss *aam* (cautere) C 16 (Ep. *haam*, Erf. *fam*) is (with some diffidence) referred to *ām* 'weaver's reed', *abunden* (expeditus) E 364 identified with *onbundaen* (quoted as if really occurring in Corp.); the component parts of *goodaeppe* (citionium) C 439 are mentioned as if separate words; *aera* S 574 is quoted as an Old English

<sup>1</sup>) whatever that means.



word without any attempt at an explanation; of the three forms *aetgaere* (*ansatae*) A 603, *ægtæro* (*falarica*) F 67 and *æt gaeru* (*framea*) F 344, the first is called a singular, the other two plurals; *aforht* (in dies) I 195 = *ā forð* is given as a compound, *agnidine* (*detrita*) D 78 is called a dative, *ahæfd* (*suspensus*) S 636 derived from *āhebban* 'raise'; to *ampre* (*uarix*) U 8 neither the meaning nor the corresponding Mod. E. *amper* is added, and *mitta* (*exagium*) E 416 is translated 'measure', *an ege* (*luscus*) L 272 combined with late *ānēage* instead of early *ānīege*, *anmood* (*contumax*) C 597 identified with *ānmōd*; *anoða* (*formido*) F 277 and the imperative *ansceat* (*exintera*) E 411 are left without an explanation; *ascaeltte* for *aslaectae* or *-te* (*disoluerat*) D 336 is derived from *āslacian*, to *aseodenne* (*expendere*) E 542 from *āseodan* (*sic*); *asoedan* (*satiare*) S 104 is called a compound of both *sēdan* and *sadian*, *astyntid* (*hebitatus*) H 56 derived from *āstintan*, *athed* (*euiscerata*) E 328 quoted as *athied* (s. above) and derived from *ādīedan*; the p. partic. *apoht* (*commentum*) C 779 is considered as a compound of the noun *ðōht* (the same mistake is found in the edition, which adds <excogitatio> and compares E 178 *Ementum. excogitatio.*, instead of C 760 *Comminiscitur commentum. uel comentat*); *bencselma* (*sponda*) S 470 is first regarded as a compound, then (correctly) as two words; *bercae* (*latratus*) L 90 is called the nom. plur. of *beorc*; *bebītan* (*Mordicos. bibītne*. M 251) is translated 'bite' instead of 'gnaw'; on *caecbora* s. above; the non-existent *cenlic* is given as a genuine word meaning 'convenient' (s. above); *chroa* and *croha* (*citropodes*) C 382 are said to be the nom. pl. of *crocc*; *cionecti* (*rimosa*) R 175 is described as the "nom. sg. or pl. masc. or fem. (of) *cinih̄t*", instead of nom. sg. (masc. or ntr.) of a form corresponding to later *cinih̄te*; *cocas*, i.e. Latin *cloacas* (*culinia*) C 953 is called the nom. acc. pl. of *coc* (i.e. *cōc*) 'cook', though the correction is indicated in the edition; *cornuurma* (*uemiculus*) U 148 is translated 'cornworm, weevil', instead of 'scarlet dye'; *faedran* in *f. sunu* (*patruelis*) P 95 is called the gen. sg. of *fæder* 'father'; the Latin *flecta* (*cratem*) C 891, (*graticium*) G 174 is considered as an O.E. word; *foruuened* (*insolens*) I 221 is derived from *forwēnan* (which means 'suspect') instead of *forwenian*, in the teeth of *fer uuaenid* Ep., *oberuuenide* (*insolesceret*) I 209 (Ep. *ober uuaenidae*) and *forwana* 'presumption' (C. *Past.* 465, 16); *gemaad* (*uecors*) U 122 is identified with *\*gemæd*, *gescroepnis* (*conpedium*) C 781 with *\*gescroopenys*; *gestalum*, i.e. *gestālum* (*obiectioibus*) O 105 is defined as the dat. pl. of *\*gestal* 'obstacle'; the later form of *haeb* (*salum*) S 59 is said to be *heaf*; *hlyte* (*portio*) P 506 is called a variant form of *hlyt* (i.e. *hl̄tet*) 'portion' and the accusative *scioldenne* (*tutellam*) T 329 (= Ep. *scilindi nnae*, Erf. *scildinnae*) is taken for the gerund of *scioldian* (l. *scildan*) 'to shield'.

This list of sins, although a long one, is not even complete, and yet by glancing into Toller's *Supplement* most of the mistakes might have been avoided. For experts it is not a serious thing that the Index is unreliable, but Latin scholars ignorant of Old English should be warned against putting trust in this bungle work, which is far beneath the high scientific standard of Prof. Lindsay's part of the volume.

CHAUCER, *The Clerkes Tale of Oxenford*. Edited by KENNETH SISAM. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923. XXV + 78 pp. 2/3 net.

There are a good many editions of parts of the *Canterbury Tales* for beginners, and some of these at any rate are very satisfactory. But there is room for an admirable little book like the present; it is excellent both in outward appearance and in substance, as might be expected from the press that printed and the scholar that edited it.

The clerk's tale is perhaps not the most characteristic of the *Canterbury Tales*, but it seems well suited for school use, and as such the book is probably meant in the first place. Of course it can only be successful if the master knows his subject, and although many English schools may adhere to the system of entrusting the teaching of English to the least capable master, there are no doubt a good many schools that are able to obtain properly qualified masters. On the continent the book will be welcome to students who wish to begin the study of Middle English. For these there is also the *Second Middle English Primer* by Sweet, a little book that does not seem to have met with the success that it deserves. Sweet's book indeed, is not superseded by Mr. Sisam's: we strongly advise real students to take both. Sweet is unsurpassable, as usual, in the concise and minutely exact presentation of all that is necessary for a thorough linguistic understanding of the text.

Mr. Sisam's edition opens with an introduction dealing with the fortunes of the story of Griselda from Boccaccio onwards, with special reference to Petrarch's version, as it is Chaucer's source. He indulges in the dream (he politely calls it a 'question') that Chaucer when in Italy may have met Petrarch. He is wise enough, however, to acknowledge that there is absolutely no ground for the theory. A short account of the place of the tale in the body of the *Tales* is illustrated by a reproduction of the miniature of Chaucer on horseback in the Ellesmere manuscript and a map of the pilgrims' road from London to Canterbury. These illustrations, and even the one of the well of St. Thomas at Bapchild, are more really illustrative than a few others from the Munich Boccaccio. The text is further preceded by a one-page life, and a short bibliography which suggests that the study of Middle English has made some progress: the exclusively linguistic preoccupation has given way to a more complete, perhaps we may say more humane study, for it includes such books as Jusserand's *Wayfaring Life* and Tревельян's *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. It may not be superfluous to add that this is possible only because our predecessors have done the laborious philological work that enables us to smile when we read Dryden's observations on Chaucer's language. The text that Mr. Sisam presents is not a reprint from Skeat, but an independent treatment of the text on the basis of the Ellesmere ms. The result is not epoch-making, it is true, but it is the natural thing for a good scholar. It is in this spirit that we offer a few remarks on details which we think may be improved. In line 176 Mr. Sisam reads

With hertely wyl they sworn and assenten

This should be *hertely* as a dissyllable. In the same way *havè* in line 242 and *hyè* in 1222 should be read as monosyllables. In line 687 the metre requires *leng* instead of *lenger*.

The notes are excellent and pay due attention to points of syntax. In some cases the original of Petrarch is quoted; if the book had not been intended for English schools the editor would probably have given the



complete text of Petrarch which would no doubt have been excellent for more advanced students who have no easy access to it. The last section gives a short outline of Chaucer's language and metre. The Glossary aims at giving all words that differ in meaning from present English as well as those that have disappeared. This is an improvement on most other editions of this sort. It is clear that this is no superfluity, when one considers that a modern reader cannot know that *sad corage* means 'constant heart', that *this ugly sergeant* stands for 'this dreadful servant', or that a *sturdy markys* is a 'stern marquis'. Two of these words are not given in the Glossary of the Globe edition. In this respect Mr. Sisam's book is also an improvement on Sweet.

E. KRUISINGA.

---

*Westeuropesche Letterkunde.* Door Dr. G. KALFF, Hoogleraar aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. Eerste deel, 15<sup>de</sup>—16<sup>de</sup> eeuw. Bij J. B. Wolters' Uitg. Mij. — Groningen, Den Haag, 1923. VI + 398 pp. f 8.90.

It is with a feeling akin to incredulity that one takes up a book professing to be a history of the literature of the West of Europe. Is it possible for one man to encompass and digest what has been written during the last five centuries, not only in France, Germany and England, but also in Scandinavia, Holland, Italy and Spain? And is not such an undertaking contrary to the modern spirit of specialisation, in this country of all others, where students will spend from six to eight years on the language and literature of *one* of our neighbours, in order to qualify for teaching in secondary schools? Will there be any demand for such a book?

On the other hand, it may be asked if there is not perceptible a growing dissatisfaction with the present system, in educational circles perhaps even more than in the regions of higher scholarship. Under the existing regulations a teacher of English literature may be practically ignorant of French and German, and what is worse, of Dutch literature. This, in itself, seems an undesirable state of things, nor can its results be beneficial in teaching. One wonders whether the defect, if recognized as such, could not be remedied without damage to the obvious advantages of specialist study.

However this may be, Professor Kalff's last work, only one part of which he lived to complete, is an achievement that cannot but command our serious attention. It is significant that this first attempt at a general history of literature should have been made by a professor of Dutch. At the same time, this circumstance tends to make the work a little unbalanced in some places. The space allowed to Dutch writings in proportion to the rest seems rather commensurate with their importance for a Dutch scholar than with their relative importance for European literature; and one occasionally wonders if English literature is not getting less than its due. It is quite possible, however, that the same remark would be made with respect to his subject by a student of French or German; in which case it would merely mean that the specialist's field of study, being much narrower than the author's, allows him to go into more detail. A few observations may serve to illustrate this point.

On page 1 it says that from Edward I to Cromwell no Jews were allowed to live in England. A reference to Boas' *Shakespeare and his Predecessors* (p. 217) disproves this statement. Illustrations from English literature of the

hatred against the Jews might have been cited from the *Play of the Sacrament* in Manly's *Specimens* (I, 239 ff.) and from the ballad of *Sir Hugh, or The Jew's Daughter* in Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*. It will be interesting to learn what new light will be shed on this question by a dissertation, now in the making, on the Jew in English literature.

On p. 31 (satires on clerical abuses) no mention is made of Heywood's *Pardoner and Frere*, nor of any other English examples.

On p. 130, in *re* riddles and songs of impossible things, references are given to Dutch and German sources; cf. also those in Child. Similarly on pp. 258 and 264; religious dancing carols may also be instanced from English.

The Spanish tale *El siervo libre de Amor* (p. 193) reminds one of Heywood's *Play of Love*. The three stages of its author's love: Loving and Beloved; Loving not Beloved; Neither Loving Nor Loved — have their counterparts in Heywood's personages: The Lover Not Beloved, The Woman Beloved not Loving, The Lover Beloved, Neither Lover nor Loved (Cf. Brandl, *Quellen*, 159 ff.). *El siervo libre* dates from the middle of the 15th century; a similar booklet *El carcel de Amor* was first published in 1492. As the earliest edition we have of the *Play of Love* is dated 1534, there might be ground for modifying Tucker Brooke's designation of it as a 'patent anachronism' (*Tudor Drama*, 95).

The omission of Heywood's *Merry Play* from the section on farces of marital life (p. 243 ff., also p. 128) may have been due to an intention to deal with Heywood in a second volume; as a matter of fact, he is not mentioned at all in the present one. The delimitation between the subject-matter for this volume and for what was to have been the next is somewhat irregular, as is indeed denoted by the "15<sup>de</sup>—16<sup>de</sup> eeuw" on the title-page.

Pp. 252 ff. Prof. Kalf points out that the preponderant visual element in 15th century drama caused the literary value of the text to be of less importance (cf. modern opera). When giving a sample of the few rare instances of real literary merit, he takes it from the French *Mystère du vieil Testament*. A closely similar passage might have been quoted from the Brome Play of *Abraam and Isaac*.

More cases might be mentioned where a reference to English sources would have added to the fullness of the account. Such details, however, merely obscure the great merits of the work: the author's extensive reading, and his genius for seizing and pointing out the general in the particular. This does not mean that the book has not its faults. Specialisation has its drawbacks, but so has generalisation. When the literatures of a group of nations are surveyed as one whole, the distinctive characteristics of each are apt to be dimmed. There is more than one instance of this in the present work; only the most important can be dealt with.

The section on the Renaissance (pp. 37-67) is less satisfactory than most chapters in the book. Nor is it quite relevant to its general tenor. There is little of specific Renaissance quality about "the popular literature — ballads, carols, miracle plays — which counts most in the fifteenth century; except for Malory himself, who has nothing to do with all these."<sup>1</sup>) It seems the more pity, therefore, that the author should have filled so many pages with more or less traditional views on the revival of learning and the rise of individualism. He does not, indeed, start from the fall of Constantinople, as popular textbooks still do, but he goes hardly beyond Burckhardt. Yet he had read <sup>2</sup>) Huizinga's statement in *De Gids*, Nov. 1920: „Ten onrechte

<sup>1</sup>) E. K. Chambers, *Sir Thomas Malory* (1922).

<sup>2</sup>) P. 42, note.



geldt, in navolging van Burckhardt, het individualisme als de alles beheerschende grondtrek der Renaissance. Het is hoogstens één trek uit velen, door volmaakt tegenstrijdige trekken gekruist." He lays himself out to illustrate the rise of individualism, apart from Renaissance influence, by a great many picturesque details; some of them even from thirteenth century, and probably older, Icelandic sagas. A good deal is brought together under this heading that does not really belong to the same category, and one is sometimes left to speculate whether what applies to one country is equally true of another.

Generalisation also affects the account given of the revival of learning. There is not a hint that England lagged behind France and Germany, and the difference, in kind as well as in degree, in the way the Renaissance operated in England as compared with continental countries is passed over in silence.

With this reservation, one can but speak with respect of this last work of a great scholar. His merits for the study of Dutch literature have been set out in many places by those competent to judge. It remains to recommend *Westeuropesche Letterkunde* to students of English; it may widen their horizon, and call their attention to the ties connecting the literature of England with those of the continent. Above all, it may teach them not to neglect their own.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

---

*Hamlet: its textual history.* By H. DE GROOT. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger. 1923. pp. 143.

Dr. de Groot's dissertation on the history of the text of *Hamlet* has many merits. It summarizes adequately the best of what has previously been written; and quotes and comments on the more important passages in which the texts of the Quartos of 1603 and 1604/5 and the Folio differ. One of the best suggestions Dr. de Groot offers is that among the frequent repetitions of phrases (Indeed, indeed Sirs; my tables, my tables; except my life, except my life) some may be due to Burbage and others put in to please Burbage by Shakespeare who knew his fondness for them. I am a good deal impressed also by his arguments that the Folio text is not derived from an independent manuscript, as is usually said, but from that of 1604/5 modified by stage practice, including a few cases in which actors familiar with the older form of the play had revived some of its phrases and so produced the rare, but puzzling, resemblances to the First Quarto.

Dr. de Groot agrees whole-heartedly with the contention that Shakespeare must have rehandled the old play not once but twice, but is willing (like Professor F. G. Hubbard of Wisconsin) to accept the first Quarto as an abridgement of the first revision, marred by the carelessness of the hack who made it, and also of the printer, but not by the intervention of any notetaker in shorthand or dishonest minor actor trying to reconstruct passages from memory. I think in trying to dispense with both of these suppositions Dr. de Groot is driven to too poor an opinion both of the abridger and of the printer and underrates the essential complexity of the problem. The Queen's description of the death of Ophelia reads in the First Quarto:

O my Lord, the yong *Ofelia*  
 Hauing made a garland of lundry fources of floures,  
 Sitting vpon a willow by a brooke,

The enuious ſprig broke, into the brooke he fell,  
 And for a while her clothes ſpread wide abroade,  
 Bore the yong Lady vp: and there ſhe ſate ſmiling,  
 Euen Mermaide like, twixt heauen and earth,  
 Chaunting olde ſundry tunes vncapable  
 As it were of her diltrefſe but long it could not be,  
 Till that her clothes, being heauy with their drinke,  
 Dragg'd the ſweete wretch to death.

Surely it is impossible to conceive any authorized section of the Chamberlain's company mouthing such mangled stuff as this at Oxford or Cambridge; and on the other hand we have to account not only for the badness of such a speech, but for the equally notable goodness of some of those of Marcellus and of that in which Voltemar renders account of his embassy. The rhythm moreover of this last speech is late, too late, I think, to belong to a manuscript, such as Dr. de Groot supposes, partly in the hand of Kyd and partly in that of Shakespeare. It is difficult, indeed, to see why an abridger, instead of preserving this speech with great care, did not cut it out altogether. Dr. de Groot seems to me to have gone astray on these points by taking the entry of *Hamlet* in the Stationers' Register on 26 July, 1602 as seriously meant to lead up to early publication, instead of as an (unsuccessful) attempt to protect the play from piracy. Only if James Roberts had printed the 1603 Quarto, as he did that of 1604/5, could this interpretation hold good. If, as seems certain, it was printed by Valentine Simmes, it cannot be brought into any connection with the entry by Roberts. If the 1603 *Hamlet* be not a piracy, then there seems no reason for regarding the 1597 *Romeo and Juliet*, or the 1602 *Merry Wives of Windsor* or the 1600 *Henry V* as piracies; then also there are no plays which specially deserve the stigma of being "stolne and surreptitious" as distinct from others which stood in no such need of being "cur'd and made perfect", and we are back again in bibliographical chaos. But the problem of the 1603 *Hamlet* is so bafflingly difficult that I would rather thank Dr. de Groot for the light he has thrown on some points in the evolution of the text than quarrel with him. When a problem is so complex, it is not reasonable to expect to be able to construct even a hypothesis which will be satisfactory. If I quarrel with Dr. de Groot at all it is only on the ground that he does not appreciate how difficult and complex the problem really is.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

---

*Men Like Gods.* By H. G. WELLS. London, Cassell, 1923.

With his latest book *Men Like Gods* Mr. Wells returns once more to a theme that has been dear to him almost from the beginning of his wonderfully fertile literary career.

It is a fantastic romance about a people whose civilisation is far in advance of our own, giving the author ample scope to expound his ideas about social, religious and political questions and to express once again his unshakeable belief in the future of our world, in the perfectibility of the human race. The characteristics of two of the groups into which we may conveniently divide his works: the imaginative romances and the tracts on political matters, we find here fused together and by the cleverly drawn



portrait of Mr. Barnstaple, a typically Wellsian hero, the story is also connected with the third group: that of the novels pure and simple.

In his *Streifzüge durch die neueste Englische Literatur* Dr. Fehr has said: "H. G. Wells kann die phantastischen Einwohner des Planeten Mars überzeugender darstellen als Menschen von Fleisch und Blut". Dr. Fehr wrote this in 1911 and seeing that Wells had by that time already surprised the readers accustomed to his romances with that brilliant trio of "ordinary" novels: *Kipps*, *Tono Bungay* and *Ann Veronica*, containing several beautifully conceived, life-like characters, this statement seems too sweeping in its generality and was perhaps only thus phrased to make it more telling and picturesque. But if it should not be taken too literally, there is certainly a kernel of truth in it. For first of all, however improbable, however much beyond human experience Mr. Wells's fantastic creatures really are, his uncanny creative power compels us to accept them for some time at least as realities, and secondly the characters of his other novels nearly always show a tendency to live on in our imagination as general types rather than as definite, sharply individualized personalities.

On this first count Mr. Beresford in his little book on Wells (1915) makes some interesting remarks, which we think well worth quoting here; they are elucidating and apply again to the method used by Wells in his latest book. That his strange unearthly creatures have become so strikingly convincing is of course mainly due, as Mr. Beresford says, to the brilliance of his imagination and his power of graphic description, but the way in which he has used these gifts in the fantastic romances has also been instrumental in creating the powerful impression of reality they make on the reader. For Wells does not elaborate the wonder of his theme by direct description. "He is far more subtle and more effective. He takes an average individual, identifies him with the world as we know it and then proceeds gradually to bring his marvel within the range of this individual's apprehension. We see the improbable, not too definitely, through the eyes of one who is prepared with the same incredulity as the reader of the story, and as a result the strange phenomenon, whether fallen angel, invisible man, converted beast or invading Martian, takes all the shape of reality. . . . Our approach to the wonderful is so gradual and so natural that, when we are finally confronted with it, the incredible thing has become inevitable and expected. Finally it has become so identified with human surprise, anger or dismay that any failure of humanity in the chief person of the story reacts upon our conception of the wonderful intrusion among familiar phenomena."

In *Men Like Gods* we find once more the same method of narration employed to excellent purpose. We see the whole wonderful community — a Utopia reputed to exist quite near our own imperfect world, hidden from us only by some dimensional trickery — through the eyes of Mr. Barnstaple, an average well-educated liberal-minded Englishman, in many respects resembling Mr. Britling, and for all his life-likeness more a general type again than a definite peculiar individual, constituting as such a new illustration of the second point to which we referred as lending some colouring of truth to Dr. Fehr's contention.

If for convenience' sake we forget for a moment all the other distinctive features which enter into the composition of an author's originality, we may divide novelists into two great groups: some show a marked preference for the particular, others for the general. Mr. Wells may then be said to belong to the latter, which comes out the more clearly when we compare him in this respect with such an author as Joseph Conrad, a typical representative of the former group.

The sincere mutual admiration which these two great artists feel for each other, can hardly be said to emanate from an intimate relationship between their work or their conception of the ideals of art. There are of course in the great complex of their oeuvre some corresponding tendencies to be observed, but the main directions of their literary ambition are distinctly opposed. Conrad's interest is almost always concentrated on the particular, he sees the details, the slightest deviations in the various personages and situations he describes; the reader remains continually conscious of the fact that no two moments of life ever wear precisely the same aspect, the nicest differences are always taken into account. Wells on the other hand appreciates and emphasizes the general; he sees everywhere in the various incidents and individuals the corresponding; in his works the conformable, the great laws underlying the complicated phenomena of life come to the fore. Conrad's characters live on in the reader's imagination as independent, strongly marked individuals; we believe in them unconditionally, they enrich the circle of our acquaintances, they remain in our remembrance quite distinctly apart both from one another and from people we already knew, even from such as resemble them in some chief points. The character-analysis in Wells's novels is less deep, the personalities less complicated; because the petty individual differences are not insisted upon or left out altogether, his personages do not as a rule maintain themselves in our imagination as independent figures, they soon connect themselves with the image of other similar individuals whom we have met with in reality or in our reading: they resolve very readily into a type, for which they then form a further confirmation. We believe in them, because we recognize them or because we so clearly see them as representatives of a class, a group, an attitude to life. The author himself at times specially directs our attention to this type-forming quality of his characters, as in *Marriage*, to quote only one of many instances:

"Mr. Pope was one of that large and representative class which imparts a dignity to national commerce by inheriting big businesses from his ancestors . . . ."

"At first it seemed to Trafford that when he met Dowd he was only meeting Dowd, but a time came when it seemed to him that in meeting Dowd he was meeting all that vast new England outside the range of ruling-class dreams, that multitudinous greater England, cheaply treated, rather out of health, angry, energetic and now becoming intelligent and critical, that England which organized industrialism has created . . . Dowd became at last entirely representative."

Authors whose characterisation shows this generalising tendency, are apt to repeat a favourite type, their chief personages will often bear a more or less marked family likeness, which, however, need not mean that they must necessarily strike the reader as less life-like. But the 'calling-up of spirits from the vasty deep' is with them hardly ever the only concern. They are not content to depict the world as they see it, they also want to interpret it, to give direct expression to their opinions about a right conduct of life or to indicate what appears to them a possible or desirable development of mankind. H. G. Wells is one of these novelists of ideas; the desire to embody in his art his views on morals, politics and kindred subjects has always been one of the sources of his literary activity; we find it more or less suppressed in the novels proper, quite prominent in most of the other books. That he holds such a high place of honour among them is not only due to the brilliance and daring originality of his ideas, but to his great creative power, a combination of gifts not often met with.



*Men Like Gods* is again essentially a novel of ideas. As has been said, it describes a Utopian world, as seen through the eyes of an average mortal, and its structure recalls quite a little series of similar well-known English books, for the Utopia is more frequent in English literature than in any other. The plan offers the writer a twofold opportunity to put forth his opinions about the merits and more often the demerits of the society of his times: in the description of the fanciful world the reader is shown the state of happiness which ensues, when the principles the author so passionately believes in, are put into practice; and on the other hand the stories told by the chance visitor to the happy Utopians will astonish and horrify them, a procedure admirably calculated for a sly sort of sarcasm. Some of Swift's stories are run on these lines, notably that of the voyage to Brobdingnag and in its general construction *Men Like Gods* strongly resembles this strange satiric tale. But here the parallelism ceases. The community of the giants can hardly be called a Utopia, though the Brobdingnagians are on the whole gentle, civilized people, who are appalled at the English methods of warfare Gulliver proposes to them. But their state is not very far advanced compared to that of Gulliver's countrymen, whereas the Men like Gods are in all respects immeasurably superior to the earthlings. And the difference in spirit between the two writers is of far greater importance yet. Wells believes in mankind in spite of all the faults his keen critical eye detects; he sees in history a steady progress towards a brilliant future, he is more firmly convinced than any novelist before him of the practicability of the 'working out of the beast'. This faith colours all his works and from nearly every one of his books we might extract some passage in which it has found direct expression, as e. g. in *The Passionate Friends*: "What man has become and may become beneath the masks and impositions of civilisation, in his intimate texture and in the depths of his being, I begin now in my middle age to appreciate. No longer is he an instinctive savage, but a creature of almost incredible variability and wonderful new possibilities. Marvels undreamt of, power still inconceivable, an empire beyond the uttermost stars; such is man's inheritance." This glowing faith, which not even the direst experiences of the war have been able to shake, as *Mr. Britling Sees it Through* amply testifies, has of course, greatly influenced the grain and quality of his satire. For unlike that of many other writers Mr. Wells's satire does not spring from a dark subsoil of bitter disappointment or disgust, it is rather an outburst of impatience at the futile occupations, the self-deceit and egotism, the narrow moral codes, the stupid prejudices he sees people still clinging to; it is with him only a means to try and clear away more quickly the impediments standing in the way of that brighter future which he knows must come sooner or later; in his satire there is never a vestige of despair.

Mr. Barnstaple has been made the type of man who can fully appreciate the new world into which he has been accidentally thrown, because this world corresponds with the ideals he has always cherished in his heart of hearts, ideals for which, however remote they had seemed, he had tried to pave the way as far as his little strength allowed and for which he would at all times be ready to make a sacrifice. Now that he so unexpectedly sees it realized, he recognizes that it was a world "the very fellow of which had lain deep beneath the thoughts and dreams of thousands of sane and troubled men and women in the world of disorder from which he had come". And when he learns that Utopia had once passed through the same misery, the same crises our earth is passing through now, he commemorates in one of the beautiful passages in which the book abounds, the pioneers who in

spite of the bitterest discouragement, the apparently fatal defeats had always kept the ideal alive in their hearts and had patiently continued working at the tremendous task of preparing for a better state of things: "How few of these pioneers had ever felt more than a transitory gleam of the righteous loveliness of the world their lives made possible! And yet even in the hate and turmoil and distresses of the Days of Confusion there must have been earnest enough of the exquisite and glorious possibilities of life. Over the foulest slums the sunset called to the imaginations of men, and from mountain ridges, across great valleys, from cliffs and hillsides and by the uncertain and terrible splendours of the sea, men must have had glimpses of the conceivable and attainable magnificence of being. Every flower petal, every sunlit leaf, the vitality of young things, the happy moments of the human mind transcending itself in art, all these things must have been material for hope, incentive to effort".

With a shock of surprise at first, with better understanding afterwards he perceives that the other earthlings do not all share his enthusiasm for the Utopian institutions, manners and morals. For Mr. Barnstaple is not the only one that has suddenly been transposed from the Maidenhead Road to a corresponding Utopian highway. Two motorcar-loads of other human beings have been whisked into it by the daring dimensional experiment of some Utopian scientists. Among them is a priest, Father Amerton, and no sooner has he got some inkling of Utopian conceptions than he begins to preach against them in a violent and abusive manner. Among them are also Mr. Catskill and Mr. Burleigh, easily recognizable as Winston Churchill and Balfour, the changed names being wellnigh the only disguise allowed to them in this daringly direct portraiture. As great and experienced politicians they are more guarded in the utterance of their opinions than Father Amerton, but they too disapprove of much they see around them. The whole party, including a lady, a war-profiteer, a Frenchman and an American, are treated very politely by the Utopians who do everything in their power to make them comfortable. But the earthlings have unknowingly brought the germs of fever, measles and influenza with them and as the atmosphere of Utopia was definitively purged of all infectious diseases centuries before, the inhabitants have lost the last trace of resistance against such pernicious bacteria; many fall ill and the spreading epidemic necessitates the isolation of the earthlings. They are carried to an old fortress in a remote mountain region and are told that the Utopians will try to devise methods for their complete physical cleansing by means of injections. This announcement infuriates Father Amerton, for he is a confirmed anti-vaccinationist, holding vaccination to be an outrage on nature. He wants to issue a flaming protest. But Mr. Catskill surprises and delights him with a stupendous plan of retaliation. They are in possession of some effective weapons, he will use them, make war upon the Utopians, hold the fortress and then gradually conquer this new evidently quite undefended world. The proposal is received with enthusiasm. And almost immediately a fierce dispute ensues over the claims of the various nations to dominate the lands to be conquered, a dispute which enables the author to bring out the characteristics of the English, French and American diplomats and to give us a very clear satirical exposition of the present political conditions of Europe.

In vain Mr. Barnstaple protests against the preposterous and iniquitous plan, saying that they are like a handful of Hottentots in a showman's van at Earl's Court planning the conquest of London. He is outvoted, and when at last actual fighting appears unavoidable, he betrays his compatriots to



prevent some harmless Utopians, who come to bring them food, from falling into an ambush. He is pursued by the furious Earthlings and eventually he falls on a ridge of rock where no one can reach him, but from where there seems no escape. His reflections in this strange situation with certain death before him form one of the finest parts of the book.

Thanks to the prodigious powers of the Utopians he is rescued after all and the revolt of the earthlings is easily subdued.

For some time Mr. Barnstaple now lives alone with the Utopians and in the last hundred pages of the book he tells what he saw and learned among these enlightened beings. Their history appears up to a certain period to run pretty nearly parallel with our own, a resemblance which of course again fosters Mr. Barnstaple's belief that the progress of civilisation on earth will lead to the same happy results as in Utopia. "There is confusion in all struggles; retractions and defeats; but the whole effect seen from the calm height of Utopia, was one of steadfast advance. . . . There was no knowledge in this Utopia of which Earth had not the germs, there was no power used here that Earthlings might not use. Here but for ignorance and darkness and the spites and malice they permit was Earth to day. . . ."

Guided by a Utopian woman Lychnis and later on by a schoolboy Mr. Barnstaple makes many rambles through the beautiful domains. He describes in detail the more purely material aspect of the wonderful planet and from the long conversations with his guides we also learn much about the spiritual life of its inhabitants. They all work hard, but as in the *News from Nowhere* work has become a pleasure and everybody is always strongly conscious of being a member of a great community for whose welfare they are willing to sacrifice everything. He discusses finances, science, education, love, freedom, religion and the noble conceptions of the Utopians, their high and pure morals make him feel a 'more beastly earthling' than ever before. With great reluctance he at last leaves these happy regions, finding some consolation in the faith that similar conditions will once prevail on earth and in the resolution to work as hard as he can in the small army of pioneers preparing for a better state of things.

The ideas embodied in this last part are of course not all new. It is in the main a restatement and development of the views expressed in Wells's former books on social, religious and political questions: *Mankind in the Making*, *New Worlds for Old*, *A Modern Utopia* etc., and it also owes something to forerunners as Morris and Samuel Butler. There is however, a less well-known author with whom in spirit Mr. Wells is more closely allied, although he wrote some fifty years ago: Mr. Winwood Reade. Their conception of history is all but identical and Reade's powerful and very curious work: *The Martyrdom of Man*, a kind of universal history, a storehouse of facts and theories, intermingled with eloquent pleading, fierce denunciation and grim sarcasm, leads up to a concluding chapter of almost every passage of which we find a parallel and further development in *Men Like Gods*. A single quotation may show the affinity:

"All men indeed cannot be poets, inventors or philanthropists but all men can join in that gigantic and god-like work, the progress of creation. Whoever improves his own nature, improves the universe of which he is a part. . . . Our Faith is the Perfectibility of mankind. . . . A day will come when. . . . Love not Fear will unite the human race. The world will become a heavenly commune to which men will bring the inmost treasures of their hearts, in which they will reserve for themselves not even a hope, not even the shadow of a joy, but will give up all for all mankind. With one faith,

with one desire they will labour together in the Sacred Cause — the extinction of disease, the extinction of sin, the perfection of genius, the perfection of love, the invention of immortality, the exploration of the infinite, the conquest of creation.

"You blessed ones who shall inherit that future age of which we can only dream, you pure and radiant beings who shall succeed us on the earth, when you turn back your eyes on us poor savages, grubbing in the ground for our daily bread, eating flesh and blood, dwelling in vile bodies which degrade us every day to a level with the beasts, tortured by pain and by animal propensities, buried in gloomy superstitions, ignorant of Nature which yet holds us in her bonds, when you read of us in books, when you think of what we are and compare us with yourselves, remember that it is to us you owe the foundation of your happiness and grandeur, to us who now in our libraries and laboratories and star-towers and dissecting-rooms and workshops are preparing the materials of the human growth".

And yet, however strikingly such a passage may, in spirit and general trend, resemble many chapters of *Men Like Gods*, there is an immense difference likewise. For not only has Mr. Wells added many original ideas and suggestive details, but what is of much greater importance, he has succeeded in embodying his thoughts in a real work of art. The hopes and desires, the theories and convictions have in the mind of the artist undergone a process of crystallisation; his marvellous inventive imagination has lent them form and substance and thus made them ever so much more clear and impressive. The value of this delightfully fresh, spirited, enthusiastic book greatly surpasses the merely propagandistic, and though it will of course not in the first place appeal to those who hold with the cynic that progress means only "the exchange of one nuisance for another nuisance", one need not be at one with all the author's far-reaching conclusions to appreciate the vivid story, the picturesque descriptions and clever characterisations, the gentle humour, the illuminating satire and many of the profound observations on morals and life in general.

A. G. v. K.

## Bibliography.

### POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*Religious Lyrics of the XIV<sup>th</sup> Century.* Edited by CARLETON BROWN. XXII + 358 pp. Milford, 1924. 10/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*The Poems, English and Latin, of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury.* Edited by G. C. MOORE SMITH. 9 × 6, xxxiv. + 171 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London. 1923. 12s. 6d. n.

*Amanda*, a sacrifice to an unknown Goddess, or a free-will offering of a loving heart to a sweet-heart. By NICHOLAS HOOKES. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xxviii. + 191 pp. Elkin Mathews. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Shorter Poems of Matthew Prior.* With an Introduction by FRANCIS BRICKLEY. The Abbey Classics. Chapman and Dodd. 1923. 3/6 net.

*A Song to David and other Poems.* By CHRISTOPHER SMART. With an Introduction and Notes by PERCIVAL SERLE. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xvi. + 73 pp. "Asolo" (Church-street. Hawthorne, Melbourne, Australia). 6s.

*Poems of Lord Byron.* Selected and arranged in chronological order with a Preface. By H. J. C. GRIERSON. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6, xxx. + 398 pp. Chatto and Windus. 1923. 16s. n.

*The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë.* Edited by CLEMENT SHORTER. Arranged and collated, with bibliography and notes, by C. W. HATFIELD. xxiv. + 196 pp.

*The Complete Poems of Charlotte Brontë.* Edited by CLEMENT SHORTER. Now for the first time collected, with bibliography and notes, by C. W. HATFIELD. xxi. + 244 pp., 8 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , Hodder and Stoughton. 1923. 10s. 6d. n. each.



- Poems.* By KATHERINE MANSFIELD.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , xii. + 89 pp. Constable. 1923. 14s. n.
- The Collected Poems of John Masefield.*  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , ix. + 784 pp. Heinemann. 1923. 8s 6d. n.
- The Collected Poems of John Drinkwater.* In two volumes.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , Vol. I., xiii. + 234 pp. Vol. II., xi. + 240 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 21s.
- Birds, Beasts, and Flowers.* By D. H. LAWRENCE.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ . 207 pp. Martin Secker. 1923. 10s. 6d. n.
- Love Poems and Others.* By D. H. LAWRENCE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 64 pp. Duckworth. 1923. 5s n.
- Mandeville's Travels.* Translated from the French of Jean d'Outremeuse. Edited from MS. Cotton Titus CXVI. in the British Museum by P. HAMELIUS. Vol. I., Text, xv. + 217 pp. Vol. II., Introduction and Notes,  $9 \times 6$ , ix. + 180 pp. For the Early English Text Society. 1923. Milford, 15s. each vol., or bound together, 30s.
- HELIODORUS: An Æthiopian Romance.* The love story of Theagenes and Chariclea. Translated by THOMAS UNDERDOWNE. 1587. Corrected and edited by F. A. WRIGHT. With an Introduction.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 523 pp. Routledge. 7s. 6d. n.
- Jeremy Taylor.* A Selection from His Works. Made by MARTIN ARMSTRONG.  $10\frac{3}{4} \times 8$ , 132 pp. Waltham St. Lawrence: Golden Cockerel Press. 1923. 31s. 6d. n.
- Nightmare Abbey.* By T. L. PEACOCK. Reprinted from the edition of 1818.  $7 \times 5$ , 232 pp. Milford. 3s. 6d. n.
- Tales of a Grandfather.* In Three Volumes. Being Stories taken from Scottish History. By SIR WALTER SCOTT.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ . First Series, xii. + 419 pp. Second Series, xii. + 464 pp. Third Series, xv. + 498 pp. Gowans and Gray. 15s. n.
- The Mystery of Edwin Drood.* By Charles Dickens. Illustrated by S. L. FIELDS. With an introduction, biographical and bibliographical, by CHARLES DICKENS the YOUNGER.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xvii. + 229 pp. Macmillan. 4s. 6d. n.
- The introduction by Dickens's son contains, among other matters, the evidence of Edwin Drood's murder referred to by Mr. Matz in his letter published in the *Literary Supplement* of Nov. 15, 1923.
- The Autobiography of a Super-Tramp.* By W. H. DAVIES. With a preface by BERNARD SHAW.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xvi. + 304 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1923. 7s. 6d. n.
- First published in 1908.
- The Rover.* By JOSEPH CONRAD.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 317 pp. Fisher Unwin 1923. 7s. 6d. n.
- England, my England.* By D. H. LAWRENCE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 242 pp. Martin Secker. 7s. 6d. n.
- Love's Labour's Lost.* (The New Shakespeare.)  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ , xl. + 212 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1923. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]
- The Beggar's Opera and Polly.* By JOHN GAY. Together with the *Airs* of the Music from the original editions of 1728 and 1729.  $10 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ , xvi. + 84 + viii. + 72 + 31 pp. Chapman and Dodd. 1923.

#### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

- Spenser.* Par E. LEGOUIS. Collection des Grands écrivains étrangers. pp. 359. Bloud et Gay, 1923.
- The Elizabethan Stage.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. In four volumes.  $9 \times 6$ , Vol. I., xli. + 388 pp. Vol. II., vii. + 557 pp. Vol. III., 518 pp. Vol. IV., 467 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1923. 70s. n.
- Shakespeare's Fellows.* Being a brief Chronicle of the Shakespearean Age. By G. B. HARRISON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 207 pp. J. Lane. 1923. 6s. n.
- The Shakespeare Canon.* Part II. I.: The Authorship of "The Two Gentlemen of Verona." II.: The Authorship of "Richard II." III.: The Authorship of "The Comedy of Errors." IV.: The Problem of "Measure for Measure." By J. M. ROBERTSON.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xx. + 216 pp. Routledge. 1923. 12s. 6d. n.
- Shakespeare.* A Handbook of Information.  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , 32 pp. Media Society. 1s. n.
- This little paper-bound book gives in clear arrangement and lucid brevity the main facts and the capital suppositions about the life of Shakespeare, including notes on the signatures and his portraits. The work is admirably done; and some of it—specially the chronological list, with probable dates of the plays, might well be of occasional service to others than those for whom the book is primarily intended. It is well printed on good paper [T.]
- Die Rolle des Zufalls in Shakespeares Meistertragödien.* By RICHARD KÜHNEMUND. Studien z. engl. Philol. LXVII. Roy. 8vo, 47 pp. Halle: Niemeyer, 1923.
- Die englische Dramatisierung des Katilinastoffes.* By KARL FRIEDRICH. M.S. Diss., Erlangen, 1923. Summary 1923, 8vo, 2 pp.
- Aston Cokains Werke, ihre Beziehungen zur englischen und romanischen Literatur, insbe-*

*sondere zur Commedia dell' arte.* By HERMANN SPAEMANN. M.S. Diss., Münster 1922. Summary 1923. 8vo, 4 pp.

*Studien zu William Chamberlaynes Pharonnida.* By ALBERT JOSEF JANSSEN. M.S. Diss. Münster 1922. Summary 1923. 8vo, 4 pp.

*Das poetische Bild bei Edmund Waller.* By FRIEDA BAAK. M.S. Diss., Münster 1922. Summary 1923. 8vo, 5 pp.

*Samuel Butler, the Author of Hudibras.* By J. VELDKAMP. Hilversum, Electr. Drukkerij „De Atlas“. 1923. Pp. 239.  
Diss. Amsterdam.

*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Library of Samuel Pepys.* Part III. Mediaeval Manuscripts. By DR. M. R. JAMES. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, x.+128 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 1923. 12s. 6d. n.

*John Gay.* Biography. Edited by the late W. H. KEARLEY WRIGHT. The Fables. Illustrated with wood engravings from drawings by WILLIAM HARVEY. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×6<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, 313 pp. Warne. 1923. 42s. n.

*Doctor Johnson: A Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism.* By PERCY HAGEN HOUSTON. 9<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×6<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, vii.+280 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford 1923. 15s. n.

*Letters by the Right Hon. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.* With biographical introduction by HANNAFORD BENNETT. (The Carlton Classics.) 6×4, 171 pp. John Long. Cloth, 2s. n.; leather, 3s. n.

*Journal of the Printing-Office at Strawberry Hill.* Now first printed from the M.S. of HORACE WALPOLE. With notes by PAGET TOYNBEE. 10<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×8, ix.+150 pp. Constable. 1923. 42s. n.

*Charles Robert Maturin: His Life and Works.* By NILO IDMAN. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 326 pp. Constable. 7s. 6d. n.

*Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century.* By J. G. ROBERTSON, Professor of German Language and Literature in the University of London. Pp. vi.+298. Cambridge University Press, 1923. 2/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760-1800.* By EDWARD D. SNYDER. 7<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>×5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xi.+208 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

The author contributes a detailed study of the nature and extent of the Celtic Revival in the late eighteenth century, associated with the names of Gray, Mason, Macpherson, and Evans.

*Byron as critic.* By CLEMENT TYSON GOODE. Roy. 8vo. ix.+312 pp. Weimar: Wagner, 1923.

*Lord Byron im Spiegel der deutschen Dichtung.* By LUISE SCHNAPP. M.S. Diss., Münster 1922. Summary 1923. 8vo, 4 pp.

*Shelley and the Unromantics.* By OLWEN WARD CAMPBELL. 9×6, xi.+307 pp. Methuen. 16s. n.

*The Life and Work of Joanna Baillie.* By MARGARET S. CARHART. (Yale Studies in English.) 9×5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 215 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Milford. 8s. 6d. n.

*Some Dramatic Opinions.* By SYDNEY W. CARROLL. 316 pp. London, F. V. White & Co. 1924. 4/6. net.

## LINGUISTICS, HISTORY.

*An Elementary Old English Grammar.* By JOSEPH WRIGHT and ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. viii.+192 pp. Milford, 1923. 6/— net.

*An Elementary Middle English Grammar.* By JOSEPH WRIGHT and ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. xi.+214 pp. Milford, 1923. 7/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Das Zeitwort 'do' in Chaucers Prosa.* By RUDOLF HITTMAYER. Wiener Beiträge z. engl. Philol. LI. Roy. 8vo, vi.+126 pp. Wien: Braumüller, 1923.

*Orthographie und Flexion in Lord Berners' Golden Boke of Marcus Aurelius Emperour and Eloquent Oratour.* By ANNA FIEDLER. MS Diss. Münster 1922. Summary 1923, 8vo, 5 pp.

*Untersuchung der Aussprache von Edmund Waller (1606-1687) auf Grund seiner Reime.* By HANS BAAK. MS Diss., Münster 1922. Summary 1923. 8vo, 6 pp.

*The Dialect of Robert Burns as spoken in Central Ayrshire.* By SIR JAMES WILSON. 195 pp. Milford, 1923. 6/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Die Verwendung der Mundart in Blackmores Romanen.* By KATHARINA CASPAR. Roy. 8vo, ii.+30 pp. Giessen: Engl. Seminar d. Univ., 1923.

*Die Verwendung der Mundart bei Thomas Hardy.* By MARTHA DÖLL. Roy. 8vo, 24 pp. Giessen: Engl. Seminar d. Univ., 1923.



## PERIODICALS.

**De Stem.** III, 10—12. Oct., Nov., Dec. 1923. Include A. G. van Kranendonk, Joseph Conrad. (837—850, 883—900, 978—990).

**De Gids.** Jan. 1924. H. de Groot, Een nieuwe methode in het Shakespeare-onderzoek. (76—87).

**Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles.** No. 1. Oct.—Nov. 1923. Includes: Paul de Reul, *Sordello* et l'Obscurité de Browning.

**Revue de Littérature Comparée.** III, 4. Oct.—Dec. 1923. A. E. Zucker, Théâtre élisabéthain et théâtre chinois. — S. B. Liljegren, La pensée de Milton et Giordano Bruno. — G. Maugain, Fontenelle et l'Italie. — G. R. Havens, James Madison et la pensée française. — F. Baldensperger, Les États-Unis dans la vie et les idées d'Alfred de Vigny. **Id.**, IV, 1. Janv.—Mars 1924. F. L. Schoell, Les mythologues italiens de la Renaissance et la poésie élisabéthaine. — A. Debidour, L'indianisme de Voltaire. — P. van Tieghem, Les Idylles de Gessner et le rêve pastoral dans le préromantisme européen. — F. Bertaux, L'influence de Zola en Allemagne. — E. Maynial, Ibsen et Fogazzaro.

**Revue Anglo-Américaine.** 1, 2. Déc. 1923. R. Galland, Quelques critiques des États-Unis. — P. Dottin, Daniel de Foe et les sciences occultes. — D. Saurat et C. Cabannes, Milton devant la médecine. — F. Delattre, William James bergsonien (fin).

**Mercur de France.** 15 Oct., 1923. J. Catel, Walt Whitman puritain. — 1<sup>er</sup> déc. L. Villard, La vie américaine d'après le conte et la nouvelle.

**Revue de France.** 1<sup>er</sup> Oct., 1923. Valéry Larbaud, Samuel Butler.

**Nouvelle Revue française.** Nov. 1923. Ramon Fernandez, Le message de Meredith

**Anglia.** XLVII, 4. H. M. Flasdieck, Die sprachliche Einheitlichkeit der *Ormmulums*. — F. Koch, Thomas Nabbes, ein zu wenig beachteter Dichter. — Otto B. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortforschung.

**Beiblatt zur Anglia.** XXXIV, 10 (Oct. 1923). Reviews, including Max Förster, on Hubbard, The First Quarto Edition of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and on V. østerberg, Studier over Hamlet-Teksterne I. — H. Mutschmann, on G. Bordukat, Die Abgrenzung zwischen Vers und Prosa in den Dramen Shakespeares. — I. Caro, on I. v. Ingersleben, Das Elisabethanische Ideal der Ehefrau bei Overbury (1613). — S. B. Liljegren, on Lane Cooper, A Concordance of the Latin, Greek and Italian Poems of John Milton. — Also an article: H. M. Flasdieck, Studien zur me. Grammatik.

**Archiv f. d. Stud. d. neueren Sprachen u. Literaturen.** CXLVI, 1/2. (1923). Includes: G. Schleich, Lydgates Quellen zu seinem *Guy of Warwick*. — Mally Behler, Die Beziehungen zwischen Sidney und Spenser. — Fritz Fiedler, Die Vorgeschichte der Hauptgestalten in Dickens' '*Christmas Carol*'. — Notes, including G. Herzfeld, Goethe und Holcroft. — Reviews, including Max Förster, on Mezger, Angelsächsische Völker- und Ländernamen. — F. Liebermann, on Savage, Minutes and accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and other records 1553—1620. — W. Dibelius, on Else Wentscher, Das Problem des Empirismus, dargestellt an John Stuart Mill. — W. Keller, on Stern, Swift, Swiftly, and their Synonyms.

**Germ. Rom. Monatsschrift.** XI, 9/10 (Sept.—Oct. 1923). Includes Hanna Hellmann, Kleists '*Prinz von Homburg*' und Shakespeares '*Mass für Mass*'.

**Preussische Jahrbücher.** CXIV, 1. (Oct. 1923). Includes: Emil Daniels, Benjamin Disraeli: Earl of Beaconsfield (Part III).

**Die Literatur.** 26. Jahrgang des **Lit. Echo**, 1—3 (Oct.—Dec. 1923). Reviews, including Edgar Gross, on Lüdeke, Ludwig Tieck und das alte englische Theater.

**Zs. f. franz. u. engl. Unterricht.** XXII, 4 (1923). Includes: R. F. Arnold, Miltons '*Il Penseroso*' deutsch. — K. Arns, Bemerkungen zu Hardys Lyrik. — Reviews, including H. Jantzen, on Kuhlmann, *Hamlet* — Erkenntnisse, and on Schirmer, Der englische Roman der neuesten Zeit. — W. Preusler, on Flasdieck, Forschungen zur Frühzeit der neuenglischen Schriftsprache, and on O. Ritter, Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte.

**Modern Language Notes.** XXXVIII, 8. Dec. 1923. Includes: A. E. Longueil, The Word "Gothic" in Eighteenth Century Criticism. — N. F. Adkins, Wordsworth's *Margaret; or the Ruined Cottage*. — E. Colby, Two Slices of Literature. — H. H. Hudson, Surrey and Martial. — **Id.**, XXXIX, 1 Jan. 1924. Includes: N. J. White, The Shelley Society Again. — F. E. Ratchford, The First Draft of Swinburne's *Hertha*. — R. Kelso, Saviolo and his *Practise*.

# Byron.

## II. Some characteristics of his Poetry.

In this second paper on Byron, which, like the first, is meant to commemorate, in a modest way, the centenary of the poet's death (19<sup>th</sup> of April, 1824), I intend to discuss certain characteristics of his poetry that have, perhaps, never been so fully discussed as they deserve.

Goethe in one of his talks with his faithful Eckermann said that Byron "must be unquestionably regarded as the greatest talent of the century" (Der ohne Frage als das grösste Talent des Jahrhunderts anzusehen). A great many competent judges, British and foreign, among his contemporaries were of the same opinion. At present very few critics would place him beside the great poets of modern times — Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe. Assigning to each celebrated writer his proper niche in the great temple of fame is an impossible and somewhat childish undertaking. Still it is a most important function of criticism to measure all literature by a perennial standard of poetic excellence, nothing being so hurtful to true judgment as the purblind enthusiasm of readers who find their own feelings and prejudices voiced in melodious verse. The qualities that constitute a great poet would seem to be four in number. He must be a seer. He must be a man of powerful and lofty imagination. He must be a synthetic, constructive genius. He must possess the gift of poetic transmutation.

It is not so easy to define what is meant by a seer in the aesthetic sense. A moral philosopher constructs his conception of life and of the world by a slow process of inductive thinking. It is, at best, an intellectual system, to which its maker and his school will refer for solving mental problems. The seer's knowledge of life and of the world is not an extraneous product of dialectics; it is acquired spontaneously, intuitively, directly; it is part of his consciousness; he need not reason about problems — the problems solve themselves as soon as they are proposed. He sees or feels the relative importance of things, their connection, their meaning, from the heights of contemplation, which he never leaves. He may write about a dew-drop on a bud, but he writes so that the hidden life of the boundless Universe is manifested by the dew-drop. When Shakespeare writes

"Nothing of him that doth fade  
But doth suffer a sea-change  
Into something rich and strange —"

or when Wordsworth says

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting —"

he is a true seer. But it is only after living by such poetry for years that we begin to realize its profound truth and rare beauty.

Byron was not a seer — or his life would have been different. Still, when inspired, he could write passages of deep meaning.

In *Cain* there are descriptions of cosmic breadth.

"Tis a fearful light!

No sun, no moon, no lights innumerable.  
The very blue of the empurpled night  
Fades to a dreary twilight, yet I see  
Huge dusky masses; but unlike the worlds  
We were approaching, which, begirt with light,  
Seem'd full of life even when their atmosphere  
Of light gave way, and show'd them taking shapes  
Unequal, of deep valleys and vast mountains;  
And some emitting sparks, and some displaying  
Enormous liquid plains, and some begirt  
With luminous belts, and floating moons, which took,  
Like them, the features of fair earth: —"

Sublime are Adah's words about Lucifer:

" . . . . thou seemst  
Like an ethereal night, where long white clouds  
Streak the deep purple, and unnumber'd stars  
Spangle the wonderful mysterious vault  
With things that look as if they would be suns —  
So beautiful, unnumber'd and endearing;  
Not dazzling, and yet drawing us to them,  
They fill my eyes with tears, and so dost thou."

The descriptions of "swimming shadows and enormous shapes" in the abyss of space, suggested by the reading of Cuvier, as Byron tells a correspondent, have a strange touch of grandeur.

"And yon immense  
Serpent, which rears his dripping mane and vasty  
Head ten times higher than the haughtiest cedar  
Forth from the abyss, looking as he could coil  
Himself around the orbs we lately look'd on —  
Is he not of the kind which bask'd beneath  
The tree in Eden?"

A poet's second claim to pre-eminence in his craft is a powerful and lofty imagination. The conceiving of stupendous mythological figures, metaphysical types, or of exceptionally gifted human beings on a heroic scale has always been regarded as the primary function of the poet's fancy. The sublimity of the subject, the vastness of the stage are important qualifications. Byron's imagination was rather of the creative than of the penetrative sort. His personifications are less realistic and convincing than Dante's, and, though grand sometimes and awful, less majestic than Milton's. Byron was, perhaps, too clever and too cynical to be a great creator. Still, of course, he is greater than Keats, Coleridge and even Wordsworth in this respect.

In the smaller poems and in the humorous epics we notice a curious lack of diversity in the characters of his heroes. Nothing can be less true than Sir Walter Scott's assertion — "As various in composition as Shakespeare himself, Lord Byron has embraced every topic of human life, and sounded every string on the divine harp, from its slightest to its most powerful and heart-astounding tones." As a matter of fact, he invented but one type, Manfred, and even that is a great achievement; for the type lived and the hero had a numerous progeny, especially in France. He was too self-centred to take



an interest in human characters which differed greatly from his own and too careless to study them for his poetic undertakings. His own sorrows and loves and affairs haunted him through life; they crop up again and again while he is composing and get mixed up with his subjects, thus hampering the true creative impulse. It is clear that he had no sharp outlined portrait in his mind when he began to describe Don Juan's mother, but as he went along Donna Inez assumed his wife's features:

"In short, she was a walking calculation,  
Miss Edgeworth's novels stepping from their covers,  
Or Mrs. Trimmer's books on education,  
Or 'Coelebs' Wife' set out in quest of lovers,  
Morality's prim personification,  
In which not Envy's self a flaw discovers;  
To others' share let female errors fall,  
For she had not even one — the worst of all."

Dealing with his imagination we have to notice a very curious fact about the principal characters in Byron's serious poems: behind the living hero of flesh and blood there looms a supernatural double and behind that again a third, still vaguer, grander, more poetical; and Byron occasionally confuses the three. It is as though he were composing on different planes of consciousness. In *The Giaour* we read how the Christian kills Hassan for ordering his unfaithful wife to be drowned. Even in the first part of the poem the Giaour is rather an apparition than a human being, thundering by, meteor-like, on a black horse, flecked with foam -- leaving a troubled memory. In the second part the transformation is complete. The friars of the monastery where he lives do not know what he has done or who he is. His uncanny appearance and conduct excite their distrust, though keener observers discover that he must once have been a noble soul and of high lineage

"His floating robe around him folding  
Slow sweeps he through the column'd aisle."

He has, for no reason assigned, become the man of sin and gloom, a mysterious creature burdened with the curse of the evil eye, a kind of wicked magician, we might imagine. His behaviour and character, at all events, are not explained by what we are told of his former life. The original hero is completely superseded by a second conception of an occult and grander nature by which Byron's fancy was perpetually haunted. And in the background we discern, here and elsewhere, the dimly outlined and gigantic shape, sublime and mournful, which poets have called Lilith, Night, Melancholy or Lucifer.

Manfred is a more perfect embodiment of the second spirit.

"For if the beings, of whom I was one, —  
Hating to be so, — cross'd me in my path,  
I felt myself degraded back to them,  
And was all clay again. And then I dived,  
In my lone wanderings, to the caves of death,  
Searching its cause in its effect; and drew  
From wither'd bones, and skulls, and heap'd up dust,  
Conclusions most forbidden. Then I pass'd  
The nights of years in sciences untaught,  
Save in the old time; and with time and toil,

And terrible ordeal, and such penance  
 As in itself hath power upon the air,  
 And spirits that do compass air and earth,  
 Space, and the peopled infinite, I made  
 Mine eyes familiar with Eternity."

All Byron's descriptions of nature have one characteristic in common — they are principally made up of strings of nouns charged with the most potent poetical associations. Every student knows the opening stanza of *The Bride of Abydos*,

"Know ye the land where the cypress and myrtle  
 Are emblems of deeds that are done in their clime?  
 Where the rage of the vulture, the love of the turtle,  
 Now melt into sorrow, now madden to crime!  
 Know ye the land of the cedar and vine,  
 Where the flowers ever blossom, the beams ever shine;  
 Where the light wings of Zephyr, oppress'd with perfume,  
 Wax faint o'er the gardens of Gul in her bloom;  
 Where the citron and olive are fairest of fruit,  
 And the voice of the nightingale never is mute:  
 Where the tints of the earth, and the hues of the sky,  
 In colour though varied, in beauty may vie,  
 And the purple of ocean is deepest in dye."

Properly speaking, this is not description, in the modern sense, at all. Indeed Byron's sense of colour, of form, of sound, of scent is of the crudest; the sculpturesque element is almost wholly wanting and panoramic vision is rare. But his phraseology is highly suggestive. In other words: he does not refer us to beautiful or lovely experiences in the actual world, but appeals to the reader's imagination, to his shadowy conceptions of some dreamlike universe, some poet's paradise, which, for the nonce, is decked out with the traditional scenery and imagery of the near East, which Moore and others had made popular.

Byron, then, always selects his words, not because of the image they present to the "inward eye", but because of their occult power over our imaginative sensibility, because of the chains of vague associations linked to them. To illustrate the effect of such associations I cannot do better than to quote a passage from Walter Pater's study of Dionysus. "Let the reader reflect what the loss would be if all the effect and expression drawn from the imagery of the vine and the cup fell out of the whole body of existing poetry; how many fascinating trains of reflexion, what colour and substance would therewith have been deducted from it, filled as it is, apart from the more awful associations of the Christian ritual, apart from Galahad's cup, with all the various symbolism of the fruit of the vine." In the same essay Pater gives a specimen of such complex associations clustering about the commonplace word, water: ". . . . those people of the vineyard, whom the prophet Melampus had taught to mix always their wine with water, and with whom the watering of the vines became a religious ceremony; the very dead, as they thought, drinking of, and refreshed by the stream. And who that has ever felt the heat of a southern country does not know this poetry, the motive of the loveliest of all the works attributed to Giorgione, the *Fête Champêtre*, in the Louvre; the intense sensations, the subtle and far-reaching symbolism, which, in these places, cling about the touch and

sound and sight of it? Think of the darkness of the well in the breathless court, with the delicate ring of ferns kept alive just within the opening; of the sound of the fresh water flowing through the wooden pipes into the houses of Venice, on summer mornings; or the cry *Acqua fresca!* at Padua or Verona, when the people run to buy what they prize, in its rare purity, more than wine, bringing pleasures so full of exquisite appeal to the imagination, that, in these streets, the very beggars, one thinks, might exhaust all the philosophy of the epicurean."

In the same way minds less susceptible to artistic symbolism than Pater's and not so well stored with learning might succeed in tracing the vistas of recollections and dreams, each in its peculiar sphere of emotions, which start into being when we read about cypress and myrtle, cedar and vine, citron and olive, the gardens of Gul and the purple<sup>1)</sup> ocean. The ancient literature of Greece and Rome, the narratives of the Old and the parables of the New Testament, the fairy-tales of the Levant, the epics of Spain and Italy, the frescoes of Tuscany and the canvases of Umbria, are bound up with the words. Now Byron, though a man of the world in all matters of a practical nature, was by no means a realist in poetry. There is no doubt that he loved the moods and emotions which his verse evoked, but we may be justified in doubting his love for the objects he describes. He may be profitably compared with Keats in this respect. In the somewhat curious sacrament with which *Endymion* opens the poet assigned a place to many "things of beauty" that were dear to him in real life:

"Such the sun, the moon,  
Trees old, and young, sprouting a shady boon  
For simple sheep; and such are daffodils  
With the green world they live in; and clear rills  
That for themselves a cooling covert make  
'Gainst the hot season; the mid-forest brake,  
Rich with a sprinkling of fair musk-rose blooms:"

Daffodil and musk-rose are "poetical" enough and appeal to every imagination, but "trees old and young" sounds prosaic to any reader who does not truly love them in the real world. To Keats, as to Wordsworth, all natural objects were, in themselves, springs of poetic joy. To Byron they were starting points where his fancy took wing to find their imaginary "double" in a fairy world of starlight and rainbow hues. Consequently he did not much trouble to study "external nature". He could not have sounded these "woodnotes wild":

"Tis the early April lark,  
Or the rooks, with busy caw,  
Foraging for sticks and straw.  
Thou shalt, at one glance, behold  
The daisy and the marigold,  
White-plumed lilies, and the first

---

<sup>1)</sup> The epithets "purple" and "wine-coloured" are often bestowed on the Mediterranean. "A sudden storm the purple ocean sweeps" (Pope's *Iliad*). But the locks of Narcissus, the rosy lips of Venus, even white velvet were called purple by antique writers. Professor Tyndall suggests that the soft green of the sea, shadowed by clouds, assumes a purple hue. When Macaulay wrote "Night sank upon the dusky beach, and on the purple sea", (*The Armada*) he described a well-known effect of sunset. Byron, in the lines quoted above, uses purple as a general attribute of the sea, for the purpose of awakening classical recollections.



Hedge-grown primrose that hath burst;  
 Shaded hyacinth, alway  
 Sapphire queen of the mid-May;  
 And every leaf, and every flower  
 Pearléd with the self-same shower.  
 Thou shalt see the field-mouse peep  
 Meagre from its celléd sleep;  
 And the snake all winter-thin  
 Cast on sunny bank its skin;  
 Freckled nest-eggs thou shalt see  
 Hatching in the hawthorn-tree,  
 When the hen-bird's wing doth rest  
 Quiet on her mossy nest."

But Byron's vagueness of representation is by no means a demerit. What his poetry loses in point of graphic delineation is more than made up for by visionary freedom and power. The reader's individual fancy, when electrified by a word, will soar the higher and make the more curious discoveries when untrammelled by the poet's qualifications.

"There mildly dimpling, Ocean's cheek  
 Reflects the tints of many a peak  
 Caught by the laughing tides that lave  
 These Edens of the eastern wave:  
 And if at times a transient breeze  
 Break the blue crystal of the seas,  
 Or sweep one blossom from the trees,  
 How welcome is each gentle air  
 That wakes and wafts the odours there!  
 For there the Rose, o'er crag or vale,  
 Sultana of the Nightingale,  
     The maid for whom his melody,  
     His thousand songs are heard on high,  
 Blooms blushing to her lover's tale:  
 His queen, the garden queen, his Rose,  
 Unbent by winds, unchill'd by snows,  
 Far from the winters of the west,  
 By every breeze and season blest,  
 Returns the sweets by nature given  
 In softest incense back to heaven."

These truly Byronian lines, in spite of their obsolete apparatus and phraseology, have lost little of their hypnotic charm. Detaching us from the real world they reveal a glimpse of "the Islands of the Blest", "The Land of everlasting Summer", "Fairyland", "Bimini", or whatever other name languishing humanity may have invented in the course of weary ages to symbolize its sublimest aspirations. This object, dear to all romantic writers is effected by simple means. A sense of wonder underlies all our artistic emotions. When, for example, the medieval poets attribute a symbolic meaning to various precious stones, they express in a primitive way a fact of which no sensitive modern mind is ignorant: that from the limpid sparkling beauty of ruby or emerald, the fragrance of roses, the song of the nightingale, emanate thrills which do not appertain to the world of everyday life, but seem to belong to a sphere beyond our ken. "The blue

crystal of the seas" is not mere water — it is some hallowed essence, reminding us of sapphire and referring in inscrutable ways to symbolic and mystic experiences on the verge of human consciousness.

Most of the blandishments in the lines cited above, are not by any means so dignified. A little introspection shows that the wave, the breeze, the blossoms, the rose, the nightingale and the rest have hardly any intellectual or, for that matter, any artistic meaning at all, but are only so many subliminal notes, forming a chord of feelings, or rather: inducing a state of consciousness made up of bliss and vague longing. The reader will notice that the words whose sense is reduced to a minimum, such as *laughing* tides, *wafts*, the *sweets* of nature — act most powerfully. Eighteenth century poetry was very rich in words which, like the notorious "bower", really mean nothing at all to the understanding and a whole world of rapture to the heart. Heine's earlier poems are equally remarkable in this respect. The greater part of them is mere sentimental twaddle, but their emotional influence is curiously forcible. The hackneyed lines, which our womenfolk still sing

"Aus meinen Thränen sprieszen  
Viel blühende Blumen hervor,  
Und meine Seufzer werden  
Ein Nachtigallenchor —"

are revolting nonsense. Yet they appeal, and appeal powerfully, to some organ of the soul. This all-pervading substance of inane poetic sentiment is a vital constituent of all Romantic literature. It may be humiliating, in forming literary estimates, to take into account an element which defies analysis and cannot even be called an imaginative factor, but no critic who would explain the specific flavour of Byron's poetry or its immense popularity can afford to ignore it.

All Byronic verse, however, is not bland and languishing. He is also attracted by what is passionate, tempestuous. He likes to dwell on scenes of devastation

" . . . . . these blasted pines  
Wrecks of a single winter, barkless, branchless,  
A blighted trunk upon a cursed root."  
"Ye avalanches, whom a breath draws down  
In mountainous o'erwhelming."  
"The mists boil up around the glaciers; clouds  
Rise curling fast beneath me, white and sulphury,  
Like foam from the roused ocean of deep Hell,  
Whose every wave breaks on a living shore,  
Heaped with the damn'd like pebbles."

This passage naturally leads to a discussion of the curious old-fashioned apparatus of tropes, machinery, language, which Byron never wholly relinquished. Like the 17th and 18th centuries he used classic mythology for ornamental purposes: pale Hecate's blaze; Dian's wave-reflected sphere; Love's sad archery; the Muses' tales. He cloy us with personification: keen Vengeance; gore-faced Treason:

"And Morn in secret shall renew the tear  
Of Consciousness awaking to her woes,  
And Fancy hover o'er thy bloodless bier."

We have also to notice his vocabulary. The aim of all modern poetry is to remove us from the sphere of commonplace existence. There is a scale of graduated ascents in the artifices for un-*realising* the effects of a narrative. The simplest (and clumsiest) is the use of "poetical" language; language that, not being used in everyday intercourse, is not weighted by the associations of the real world. A whole collection — brine, steepy, dusky, billow, strain, clime, sate, feud, morn, babe, pinion — may be gleaned from any of Byron's pages. Every schoolgirl knows that at one time he was fond of borrowing obsolete words and phrases from Spenser and other Elizabethans: Paynim, leman, feere, wight, losel, boke, whilk, redde and the rest. He occasionally used them in his letters even. Only a contemporary and a Britisher to whom such innovations were a living reality could have judged of their effects on the ear and the imagination. We must content ourselves with noticing the introduction as characteristic, as were his frequent apostrophes: "Oh, Albuera!" "Lo! Chivalry!"; and the poetic licence of such lines as

"Hark! heard you not those hoofs of dreadful note?  
Sounds not the clang of conflict on the heath?  
Saw ye not whom the reeking sabre smote . . . . ."

Our generation cannot but regard such cumbrous dodges as unpoetic, but we are bound to confess that they make for variety and liveliness. Byron often has recourse to figurative language, which is involved and bombastic sometimes and nowhere more so than in *The Prisoner of Chillon*. Indeed one cannot help wondering why this jumble of false sentiment and questionable psychology became so popular. Take the initial stanza, —

"My limbs are bow'd, though not with toil,  
But rusted with a vile repose,  
For they have been a dungeon's spoil,  
And mine has been the fate of those  
To whom the goodly earth and air  
Are bann'd and barr'd — forbidden fare :"

Or the maudlin and ridiculous lines, —

"He faded, and so calm and meek,  
So softly worn, so sweetly weak,  
So tearless, yet so tender, kind,  
And grieved for those he left behind."

Or again the following, equally absurd, —

"The last, the sole, the dearest link  
Between me and the eternal brink,  
Which bound me to my failing race,  
Was broken in this fatal place."

The tendency to over-elaborate his metaphors and similitudes spoils his happy comparison of modern Greece to a dead girl, and many others.

"The fix'd yet tender traits that streak  
The languor of the placid cheek,  
And — but for that sad shrouded eye,  
That fires not, wins not, weeps not now,  
And but for that chill, changeless brow,



Where cold Obstruction's apathy  
 Appals the gazing mourner's heart,  
 As if to him it could impart  
 The doom he dreads, yet dwells upon —"

All this is rhetoric, ornament that in Byron's case is part of the inspiration, no doubt, and was not superimposed afterwards for the sake of pleasing, but which a poet of finer sensibility would have rejected.

In the third place we expect a great poet to be a synthetic, constructive genius. A powerful imagination is not enough — the visionary must have architectonic talents; he must construct an organic whole, built up of well-proportioned parts. The *Divine Comedy* and *Paradise Lost* were evidently written according to a carefully constructed plan; so were all the masterpieces of classic antiquity. But romantic writers and critics considered lawlessness in creating a fundamental necessity. It was a maxim with them that in art, as in conduct, the inspiration of the moment is so valuable that no aesthetic or moral code might modify or supersede it. This maxim implies a more or less unconscious belief in the guidance of some all-wise indwelling spirit whose dictates would naturally outweigh even the accumulated wisdom of the human race. This theory, which is responsible for some of the grossest excesses in art and in life, is, no doubt, founded on fact. It is not given to every poet and to every artist, however, to distinguish the "still, small voice" from the promptings of the fancy and the appetites. Byron, to whom all restraint was odious, followed his inspirations through life. The licence of his Muse was kept in check to a considerable extent by his reverence for eighteenth century poetical tradition, which he imbibed when young. Although he kept altering words and even recasting passages while his pieces were passing through the press at the beginning of his literary career, yet he hated the patient work with the file. He composed rapidly. "Lara I wrote while undressing after coming home from balls and masquerades, in the year of revelry 1814. The *Bride* was written in four, the *Corsair* in ten days." *The Giaour*, as he himself confesses, is a mere string of episodes. He never planned and rarely matured his undertakings. *Don Juan*, his only poem of large proportions, is devoid of unity; it might have been indefinitely prolonged. But as he grew older the "irregular" style of some contemporaries began to irritate Byron and he took refuge with Aristotle, whose poetics, for him, were hallowed by the associations of his youth at Harrow and Cambridge. His "regular dramas like the Greek" were failures. They are hopelessly dull.

A great poet, indeed any poet, must possess the gift of poetic transmutation. At the time of his attack on Bowles, who had written irreverently about Pope, Byron wrote a long letter to John Murray, his publisher, which contains one of his very rare essays on poetic theory.

"Mr. Bowles asserts that Campbell's *Ship of the Line* derives all its poetry, not from *art*, but from *nature*. "Take away the waves, the winds, the sun, etc., etc., one will become a stripe of blue bunting; and the other a piece of coarse canvas on three tall poles." Very true; take away the "waves", the "winds", and there will be no ship at all, not only for poetical, but for any other purpose; and take away the "sun" and we must read Mr. Bowles's pamphlet by candlelight. But the "poetry" of the "Ship" does *not* depend on the "waves", etc.; on the contrary the "Ship of the Line" confers its own poetry upon the waters, and heightens *theirs*. I do not deny that the

"waves and winds", and above all "the sun", are highly poetical; we know it to our cost, by the many descriptions of them in verse; but if the waves bore only the foam upon their bosoms, if the winds wafted only the seaweed to the shore, if the sun shone neither upon pyramids, nor fleets, nor fortresses, would its beams be equally poetical? I think not: the poetry is at least reciprocal. Take away "the Ship of the Line" "swinging round" the "calm water", and the calm water becomes a somewhat monotonous thing to look at, particularly if not transparently *clear*; witness the thousands who pass by without looking on it at all . . . . Did Mr. Bowles ever gaze upon the sea? I presume that he has, at least upon a sea-piece. Did any painter ever paint the sea *only*, without the addition of a ship, boat, wreck, or some such adjunct? Is the sea itself a more moral, a more poetical object, with or without a vessel, breaking its vast but fatiguing monotony? Is a storm more poetical without a ship? Or, in the poem of the Shipwreck, is it the storm or the ship which most interests? both *much* undoubtedly; but without the vessel, what should we care for the tempest? It would sink into mere descriptive poetry, which in itself was never esteemed a high order of that art . . . . I recollect, when anchored off Cape Sigeum in 1810, in an English frigate, a violent squall coming on at sunset, so violent as to make us imagine that the ship would part cable, or drive from her anchorage. Mr. Hobhouse and myself, and some officers, had been up the Dardanelles to Abydos, and were just returned in time. The aspect of a storm in the Archipelago is as poetical as need be, the sea being particularly short, dashing and dangerous, and the navigation intricate and broken by the isles and currents. Cape Sigeum, the tumuli of the Troad, Lemnos, Tenedos all added to the associations of the time. But what seemed the most "*poetical*" of all at the moment, were the numbers (about two hundred) of Greek and Turkish craft, which were obliged to "cut and run" before the wind, from their unsafe anchorage, some for Tenedos, some for other isles, some for the main, and some it might be for eternity. The sight of these little scudding vessels darting over the foam in the twilight, now appearing and now disappearing between the waves in the cloud of night, with their peculiar *white* sails, skimming along as quickly, but less safely, than the sea-mews which hovered over them; their evident distress, their reduction to fluttering specks in the distance, their crowded succession, their *littleness*, as contending with the giant element; their aspect and their motion, all struck me as something far more "poetical" than the mere broad, brawling, shipless sea, and the sullen winds, could possibly have been without them.

The Euxine is a noble sea to look upon, and the port of Constantinople the most beautiful of harbours: and yet I cannot but think that the twenty sail-of-the-line, some of one hundred and forty guns, rendered it more "poetical" by day in the sun, and by night perhaps still more; for the Turks illuminate their vessels of war in a manner the most picturesque, and yet all this is *artificial*."

I must apologize for the inordinate length of his quotation, but it is the basis of Byron's poetical creed. That a thing is "artificial" does not necessarily make it unpoetical. Human interest supersedes natural beauty. "The proper study of mankind is man." In this Byron differs from the other great English romanticists, except Walter Scott. Wordsworth fills his canvas with the mountainous landscape of the Lake-district, and only admits humanity in the lowly guise of innocent country folk, especially children. Coleridge and Keats select the weirdest or the most picturesque characters, situations, costume;

Shelley invents heroes and mythological figures. With the realities of daily life they admitted no truce — as their biographies as well as their writings show. To them there was a gulf between "the prison of the actual" and the boundless domain of nature on the one hand, and the imaginative sphere on the other. They instinctively took refuge from the contaminating contact with "the world" in woods and glens, in poetry, in philosophy, in opium-dreams. Byron, the boon-companion of boxing-masters, clowns and laundresses, felt perfectly at home, as did Sir Walter, in actual life, in the world of common-place experiences. It is true, of course, that most of his poetry is as romantic as that of any of his contemporaries, but not all. If he is the moonstruck bard of *Childe Harold*, of *Lara*, of *The Giaour*, he is also the clever writer of *English Bards*, of *Beppo*, of *Don Juan*. A man whose feelings are not outraged by the sordidness, the ugliness, the commonplaceness of reality, from which a more sensitive poet would shrink, is in great danger of confounding the poetical and the trivial in writing verse.

The question at issue between the "naturals", as Byron called them and the "aesthetes", to borrow a term which came into vogue in the eighties, is much deeper than they saw. Whether a thing is poetical or not cannot be decided by such simple tests as the distinction between natural and artificial. Perhaps it is not too bold to call poetry: literature which by its subject-matter, associations, ideas or music calls up transcendental feelings which, for want of a subtler nomenclature, we call noble, sublime; which raises us up to a higher, purer sphere of blitheness and widened consciousness. There are objects both in nature and in art, there are situations in real life which of themselves affect us so that we call them poetical. A sunset, marble torso, a child bathing, a generous deed may be poetical; a motor-cycle, a vestry-meeting, a fashion-plate, an investment cannot. But many things that are unpoetical in themselves may be so regarded or described that they lose their prosaic nature; and when we say of a poet that he possesses the gift of poetic transmutation we mean exactly this. It is mostly done by regarding life from a more exalted point of view. The world no longer wearies us with its blatant trivialities when we consider it from the mountain-top. Vulgarity is nothing but the tyranny of the essentially unimportant. A loaf of bread, as the ancient and universal type of food, is in itself and apart from all associations, very poetical. It is the "roll" or the "bun" which call us down to the cheap boarding-house level of thought. Not even Walt Whitman's fervent love of humanity could sublimate such jarring lines as these.

"And give me eyes  
To see the beauty of that life and comfort  
Wherewith those by their actions  
Inspire the nations.  
Their markets, Tillage, Courts of Judicature,  
Marriages, Feasts and Assemblies, Navies, Armies."

A creator of the Byronic type whose inspiration was fitful and domineering must necessarily have found much to correct, one thinks, after the fit was over. As a matter of fact he corrected very little, and yet we rarely find passages that are quite out of tune with the poem as a whole. A kindred literary sin is that of the poet who addresses the intellect directly. His verses are not banal but frigid. True poetry is knowledge transfused with love. Also in this respect Byron's transgressions are few.



Summing up we may say that Byron was a writer of powerful and sometimes lofty imagination and true poetic passion. He was moreover a master craftsman and expressed the romantic ideals, the vague unrest and longings of his epoch, perfectly. He created at least one new type of literary hero, he founded a school of poetry and originated a distinct view of life. He was not a seer in the highest sense and not an architect in verse. It may be added that, as a satirist, he has no British rival in the 19th century.

If, therefore, he was not a genius of the highest order, it will be difficult to refuse him a place in the second rank.

F. J. HOPMAN.

## Notes and News.

**Robert Louis Stevenson.** 'Traveller and student and curious as you are, you will never have heard the name of Vailima, most likely not even that of Upolu, and Samoa itself may be strange to your ears. To these barbaric seats there came the other day a yellow book with your name on the title, and filled in every page with the exquisite gifts of your art. Let me take and change your own words: *J'ai beau admirer les autres de toutes mes forces, c'est avec vous que je me complais à vivre.*'

This is the dedication to Stevenson's book 'Across the Plains'. He was quite fond of 'Sensations d'Italie', as may appear from the following extract from a letter to Henry James:

'... Paul Bourget hagrades me. I wonder if this exquisite fellow, all made of fiddle-strings and scent and intelligence, could bear any of my bald prose. If you think he could, ask Colvin to send him a copy of these last essays of mine when they appear; and tell Bourget that they go to him from a South Sea Island as literal homage. I have read no new book for years that gave me the same literary thrill as his *Sensations d'Italie*. If (as I imagine) my cut-and-dry literature would be death to him, and worse than death — journalism — be silent on the point. For I have a great curiosity to know him, and if he doesn't know my work, I shall have the better chance of making his acquaintance.'

Paul Bourget, however, did not send a single word in reply to the dedication. Here was disappointment. Stevenson, though always kindhearted and amiable, could not help writing to Henry James afterwards:

'I thought Bourget was a friend of yours? And I thought the French were a polite race? He has taken my dedication with a stately silence that has surprised me into apoplexy. Did I go and dedicate my book to the nasty alien, and the horrid Frenchman, and the stately Furrineer? Well, I wouldn't do it again; and unless his case is susceptible of explanation, you might perhaps tell him so over the walnuts and the wine, by way of speeding the gay hours. Sincerely, I thought my dedication worth a letter.'

From what I have copied thus far, one might think that Stevenson was a forgotten outcast on some Pacific isle, even while he lived. If it were true, how much more would he be forgotten now, as he is lying on the top of Vaea Mountain, his inkstand dry and his pen lying rusty. Those who love him know better. I am almost sure that the number of friends that have known him in the flesh are only a few compared to the host of admirers that in all parts of the world love him through his books, on account of his indomitable good-humour, his fancifulness, his courage, his kindness and his inimitable style. Reading his books goes a good way towards loving him.

Though his health compelled him to live far from his friends, his mind flew back ever and again to the beloved hills of home, 'where the whaups are crying, his heart remembered how'. His friends thronged to make him forget his exilement and when he suddenly died in December 1894, the articles to commemorate him showered from the pens and in prose and verse people mourned over his loss. The all-prevailing feeling culminated in a poem by W. Robertson Nicoll of which I quote the last verse :

We have lost him, we have found him :  
 Mother, he was fain  
 Nimble to retrace his footsteps ;  
 Take his life again  
 To the breast that first had warmed him,  
 To the tried and true, —  
 He has come, our well beloved,  
 Scotland, back to you !

Small wonder, that Scotland does not forget him and that, even twenty-five years after his death, there was instituted by a great many of his former friends and posthumous admirers, the Robert Louis Stevenson Club at Edinburgh. The objects of the Club are to hold meetings at which lectures, addresses etc. may be given bearing on the life and works of R. L. S., to collect and preserve manuscripts, letters, portraits, and other articles connected with Stevenson, to form a library of the various editions of his works and of standard literature dealing with his life and works and to exhibit to the public the collection so formed; to foster interest in Stevenson's life and works by the establishment of Scholarships, Prizes etc. in the Schools and Universities of Scotland and such other purposes as the Committee may from time to time determine.

In March 1920 the house — No. 8 Howard Place — in which Stevenson was born, came into the market. It was decided to acquire it for the Club, in order to secure a permanent home for a museum of Stevensoniana in the most appropriate place for such a purpose.

A good many books, portraits, manuscripts and articles that have belonged to Stevenson, have been collected and, until possession of No. 8 Howard Place will be obtained, placed in the City Museum.

A sum of about £ 300 yet remains to be found before the price of the house is cleared off.

I am quite ignorant of the number of admirers and lovers of Stevenson in this country, but if there should be one or more among the readers of this paper, I doubt not but they will gladly take part in the raising of a lasting monument in honour of the beloved writer.

As a member of the Club I am quite to willing forward any amount, however small, to the Committee and I shall readily give any information about the Club that might be asked.

Admiraal van Gentstraat 4, Utrecht.

G. LEOPOLD.

**English Association in Holland.** Under the auspices of the 'Hollandsche Concertdirectie' Dr. G. de Koos, Mr. Clive Carey, of the *English Singers*, will give a series of concerts of English vocal music at The Hague (April 1), Amsterdam (5), Haarlem (7), Nijmegen (8) and Hilversum (10). Concerts will also be given before the Arnhem branch of the *Genootschap Nederland-*

*Engeland*, on April 4, and before the Enschede branch of the English Association on the 11th. At some of the other places arrangements have been made by which members of the E. A. shall be admitted free or at reduced prices. The programme will consist of English songs of various periods. Considering the splendid reputation the English Singers earned for themselves last autumn, members will do well not to miss these concerts.

In the early part of May, Mr. Arthur Weigall, late Inspector-General of Antiquities for the Egyptian Government, will give a series of lantern lectures on *Tut-Ankh-Amen: the Mystery and Romance of his Tomb*. It will be unnecessary to enlarge on the interest of this subject. The dates have been fixed as follows: The Hague, May 6th; Haarlem, 7th; Arnhem, 8th; Nijmegen, 9th; Amsterdam, 10th.

Information Bureau. The applications for suitable addresses for residence in England that have kept coming in even during the winter months prove that the services of the Bureau continue to be appreciated. Information has been supplied in all cases, but many members have neglected to report their experiences when returned. Yet the efficiency of the Bureau depends on this very point, the principle being that no addresses are given unless reliable recommendation has been received.

Applications, accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope, should be directed to Frederika Quanjer, 24 Weissenbruchstraat, The Hague. Special requirements should be stated, as no complete lists can be sent out. Members of the English Association may avail themselves of the services of the Bureau free of charge; other applicants should pay a fee of one guilder, which will at the same time cover a year's subscription for general membership.

---

**A Japanese Book Collector.** We have received the Catalogue of the Library of Sanki Ichikawa, Professor of English Philology in the Imperial University of Tokyo. Part I. English and Comparative Philology. Tokyo, 1924. Privately Printed. 194 pp. The professor explains that the inadequacy of the University Library, and the insufficient means at its disposal, have induced him to spend what time and money he could dispose of on the formation of a library of books on English. His ambition "to form one of the largest linguistic libraries in the world" is certainly one very difficult to realize, even if we take it to mean *private* libraries. The result, at present, is very remarkable, however. A good many of the older books, which had been stored (for the sake of greater security!) in the Seminar Library of the University, have unfortunately been lost in the fires following upon the earthquake. But what has been destroyed is not the most important or most considerable part from a practical point of view. In general philology, i.e. linguistics, the library has most of the modern books of first-rate importance, and a great many others. We only noted the absence in this department of van Ginneken's *Principes de linguistique psychologique*. But Wundt and Delbrück, as well as Paul, Dittrich, Brugmann, F. de Saussure (*Cours*) and Meillet, figure in the lists; of the older authors W. von Humboldt, Bopp, Steinthal, v. d. Gabelentz, Fr. Müller and Pott. English Language and Literature comprises pages 81-194. We were pleased to find that Dutch works have not been neglected: the names of Poutsma, Günther, Roorda and Kruisinga show that Modern English is taken as seriously as the earlier periods. Of course there is no question of completeness, in fact there can be none. The



author promises the addition of a second part containing his collection of books and pamphlets relating to English literature; these are included in the present volume only in so far as they deal with metre, style and vocabulary. The catalogue as a whole shows that all parts of English Studies are now finding students in Japan. When completed, it should form a valuable bibliographical asset.

---

**Gedenkbundel Drie Talen 1924.** The miscellany in honour of the fortieth year of issue of *De Drie Talen* has now appeared. It contains a number of articles on French, German and English. Most of the articles deal with some aspect of language, a few with literary matters. The character of the articles, too, differs widely, some treating a question for the benefit of beginners, others taking the opportunity of the special volume to enlarge the field so that they interest more advanced students. Of the latter kind, which naturally interests us most, are the articles by Mr. de Boer (in the French part), the literary articles by Mr. van Dam and Mr. Friedemann (in the German part), and Mr. Poutsma in the English section. The most interesting is no doubt Mr. Schutt's article on the aims (fortunately not chiefly on the methods) of modern language teaching. If it were generally thought that a practical knowledge of the modern language is not all that can be taught by modern language masters, their position would be a more respected one, both within the schools and without them, than it generally is now.

---

**Bryn Mawr Scholarships.** Dr. A. J. Barnouw, the Queen Wilhelmina Professor of Dutch in Columbia University, New York, writes to enlist our interest in the nine scholarships for European women given annually by Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. These scholarships are open to all women who have had university training equivalent to that denoted by the Bachelor's degree of an American University. The circular states that Scandinavian women should hold the *Cand. Philol.* or its equivalent; we take it that the same will apply to Dutch women students. The scholarships are offered for one year only, and provide for free board, lodging and tuition, additional expenses being for the student's own account. Graduate instruction is given at the College in various branches of Literature, Philology, History and Science.

Applications for the scholarships should be received by May first, and addressed to 'The Recording Dean of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, U. S. A.'

---

**Oxford Holiday Course.** A Vacation Course in the English language and literature for foreign students will be held in Oxford from July 29 to August 16. The general subject of the lectures will be Contemporary England: its Political, Social and Economic Life, and its Language and Literature. The Lecturers include Prof. H. C. Wyld, Sir Henry Penson, Mr. H. Alexander, the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, and others. The fee for the whole course is £ 4.—, for either half of the course (July 29—August 7, or August 8-16) £ 2.10.—. Enquiries should be addressed to the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, M. A., University Extension Delegacy, Acland House, Oxford.

---

**A-Examination 1923.** We quote the following from the Report in the *Bijvoegsel tot de Ned. Staatscourant*, 23 Jan. 1924, no. 16:

“Voor de akte middelbaar onderwijs A zijn dus geslaagd ruim 35 pct. van de vrouwelijke en ruim 45 pct. van de mannelijke kandidaten, gemiddeld ruim 40 pct. Voor de vrouwelijke was de uitslag iets gunstiger, voor de mannelijke daarentegen veel gunstiger dan verleden jaar, toen de cijfers achtereenvolgens 32, 33 en ruim 32 pct. waren.

In aansluiting aan de opmerking omtrent de spraakkunst, in het verslag van het vorige jaar, meent de commissie nogmaals de aandacht te moeten vestigen op de onvoldoende wijze, waarop tal van kandidaten dit gedeelte van het examen bestudeeren. Verscheidene hunner bleken in het geheel geen kennis te hebben genomen van wat in de laatste jaren op dit gebied is verschenen. Regels, waarvan de onjuistheid herhaaldelijk is aangetoond, werden nog maar al te vaak ondoordacht verkondigd. Voor een deel moeten misschien de tekortkomingen der kandidaten in dit opzicht geweten worden aan het feit, dat zij niet zelden hun opleiding zoeken bij personen, die zelf nog niet eens de volledige bevoegdheid bezitten.”

---

## Translation.

1. At last Ida was allowed to go out, was well wrapped up and escorted by Nurse in a short walk for the good of her health. 2. It was not very amusing, but the air was fresh and the change pleasant for her, although the street did not prove so cheerful as it had appeared from the nursery window. 3. In the evening Ida was sent for by her uncle. 4. She had not been downstairs since she had been taken ill. 5. The interviews with the reserved old gentleman were always formal and uncomfortable, from which Ida escaped with a sense of relief, and that evening, being still weak with her recent illness, her nervousness almost rose to terror. 6. Nurse did her best in the way of encouragement: it was true that Ida's uncle was not exactly a cheerful gentleman, but there was such a nice dessert! 7. What more could a nice young lady desire than to wear her best frock and to eat almonds and raisins in the dining-room as if she were the mistress of the house? 8. “Yet I am sorry for the child”, Nurse confided to the old man-servant after she had brought Ida to her uncle, “for his appearance would frighten a grown(-up) person, let alone a child. 9. And do you go in presently, like a good soul, if you can think of an excuse and let her see a cheerful face.” 10. But before the kind-hearted servant could find a plausible pretext for entering the dining-room and giving Ida an encouraging smile from behind his master's chair, she was in the nursery once more.

11. She had honestly tried to make herself agreeable. 12. She had made a faultless curtsy at the door — weak as she was — she had taken her place at the head of the table with all dignity and had replied nicely enough to her uncle's inquiries after her health, and anxious to keep up the conversation, had told him that the hedge was budding. 13. “What's that about the hedge?” he had asked rather sharply, and when Ida repeated her bit of spring news, he had not seemed to be much interested. 14. It was no part of the gardener's work. 15. Ida relapsed into silence, and so did her uncle. 16. He had sharp eyes and bushy eyebrows, from under which he was apt to scrutinize Ida in a way that scattered all her presence of mind. 17. This night of all nights she found his eyes upon her oftener than usual.

**Observations.** 1. *At last then, Ida was allowed to go out.* The Dutch particle — *dan* — does not express inference and had better be left untranslated. You are a tailor *then*? said his worship. (Douglas Jerrold, *Men of Character*, II. p. 128.). Why did you go there *then*? (E. M. Forster, *Howard's End*, p. 258). "Ha", said the Countess hastily, "that rumour *then* is true, Janet?" (W. Scott, *Kenilworth*.). See Poutsma I. p. 400. — *Tucked up* to their very chins (L. Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Ch. II.). I dreamed I was in bed and Betty was *tucking me up*. (*A Bad Boy's Diary*.). The storeman *tucked up* their feet in a piece of old blanket. (Katherine Mansfield in *The Adelphi* I. 1.). — *Might go out*. Except in subordinate clauses the preterite *might* is almost regularly replaced by *was (were) allowed, permitted*. (Poutsma I. 77.). See Kruisinga, *Handbook* § 383. On ordinary days she *was only allowed* to play with children of her own rank. (Oscar Wilde, *Birthday of the Infanta*.). — *Constitutional* is a colloquialism which originated at the English Universities, according to the Oxford Dictionary. *On a short walk* is correct. To accompany her on her walk. (Miss Mc. Naughtan, *The Expensive Miss Ducane*, p. 12.). He took a walk twice a day for his health's sake on principle (Leys, *Wolf in Sheep's Clothing*.).

2. *The air was crisp* = bracing. The *crisp* mountain air (*Ships that Pass in the Night*, p. 55.). It was a hard frost, that day. The air was bracing, *crisp* and clear. (Dickens, *The Chimes*.). — *Although the street did not prove quite that happy region it had looked from the nursery window*. Yet it seemed, as each month passed by, the house was not so merry and happy as before, something was fading and vanishing. (Walter De la Mare, *The Almond Tree*). *Not as merry as*. According to some grammars *not so . . . as* marks inferiority, *not as . . . as* simply expressing inequality. That this rule does not invariably hold good will appear from the following quotations: "You are a wicked man". "I am very sorry. But I am *not as* bad as you think (George Moore, *Esther Waters*). Your associations with W. cannot be *as* strong as my own. (Gissing, *Demos*, II. 141.). Her embarrassment was evidently *not as* great as his own. She smiled with friendliness. (Gissing, *The Unclassed*.). — *The nursery's window*. The genitive is reserved for the names of living things and of personified objects, apart from its occurrence in adjuncts denoting measure. We cannot say *the table's leg*, but we may speak of *the dog's leg*.

3. *That evening Ida was called to her uncle*.

4. *Since her illness*.

5. *Conversations*. — *Formal-Ceremonious*. *Formal* differs from *ceremonious* in that a *formal* person tries too hard to conform to rule in his whole bearing, as well as in his bearing towards others, while a *ceremonious* person magnifies too much the conventional rules of social intercourse; thus both are opposed to *natural*; *formal* to *easy*, and *ceremonious* to *hearty* or *friendly*. (The Century Dictionary.). To make conversation too stiff, *formal* and precise. (J. Addison in *Spectator*, No. 119.). To enter a room with a most *ceremonious* bow. (Cowper, *Letters*.). — *Reticent-Taciturn*. *Reticent* is that form of silence known as 'reserve in speaking', *taciturnity* signifies a deeper and more habitual reserve, and is usually regarded as a somewhat disagreeable quality. I am not naturally *reticent*, shy, diffident, timid (*Cassell's Magazine*, June 1910. p. 197). He seemed vaguely *reticent* as to the dog's breed. (*Royal Magazine*, Sept. 1907. p. 394.). Eustacia was *reserved* and lived very much to herself. (T. Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I. 137.). I talked with him, but not easily: he was *taciturn*. Or he may have been feeling his way. (A. Bennett, *Those United States*, p. 250.). — *Used to be formal* would imply that Eustacia had dropped her uncle's acquaintance.



6. *Did her best to hearten her. Heartening them with the sunshine of his cheerful talk.* (Pearson's Magazine, Oct. 1909, p. 408.). — *A lively (jolly) gentleman.* Ellen wasn't exactly what you would call a *lively, jolly* woman, but when things were going well — as now — she was generally equable enough. (Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes, *The Lodger*). *Was not a downright jolly gentleman.* *Downright* is often used to soften down a statement: she was not downright wicked, but flighty = niet bepaald . . . *Exactly* is employed in ironic statements to express the opposite quality: He is not exactly clever = he is stupid. *Exactly* as a "down-toner": A servant, not *exactly* dirty but unattractive, let her in. (D. H. Lawrence, *The Lost Girl*). — The word *toetje* is simply a colloquialism for 'dessert' and could not possibly be rendered by the singular 'a sweet'. Would Baby like a *sweet*? (*Windsor Magazine*, No. 248. p. 330.).

7. *What could a well-behaved young lady desire more than is correct.* — *A prim young lady.* *Prim* usually suggests unpleasant qualities, the Century Dictionary defines 'affectedly nice', 'stiffly precise'. The term is not applied exclusively to women. The *prim* spinster (Conway, *Slings and Arrows*, p. 35). Captain S., a *prim* old party (*Windsor Magazine*, Dec. 1908. p. 105.). That governess was a *prim* old person. (Stevens, *Magdalene*, p. 8.). Two thin, little girls, looking excessively proper and *prim* (Anstey, *Vice Versâ*, p. 120.). A *prim*, decorous old lady. (*Strand Magazine*, Aug. 1894.) She lifted a *prim* hand to strike. (*Century Magazine*, March 1901. p. 674.) — *Decent, dainty, genteel, young:* None of these adjectives seem appropriate. — *Thar. wearing her best frock.* As a special case is referred to the Gerund appears to be less suitable. To quote Sweet (N. E. G. § 2326) "the infinitive seems to bring out more strongly the attributes of phenomenality — action and quickness." See also Kruisinga, *Handbook* § 656. — *As if she was.* The subjunctive of the verb *to be* should always be used after *as if* and *as though* in educated English, that is unless a fact is stated. See Poutsma's *Mood and Tense of the English Verb*, p. 5. — *The lady of the house is good English.*

8. *"Though I think it a pity for the child", confided Nurse.* After direct quotations there is as a rule no inversion when the verb expresses a general meaning. See Kruisinga's *Handbook* § 2084. — *When she had left Ida with her uncle.* — *His looks are enough to frighten a grown person.* *Mien* is correct, but very dignified. A *mien* expressive of indecision (Scott, *Kenilworth*). In figure, dress and *mien* he seemed to belong to a station in society. (Cooper, *The Prairie* Ch. I.) With the *mien* of a lady (Grant Allen, *African Millionaire*, p. 317.). The dog came back to me with the most downcast and humiliated *mien*. (*Century Mag.*, Nov. 1900 p. 57.) Auray was drinking coffee with an unruffled *mien*. (Mrs. Sidgwick, *Lamorna*, p. 61.) — *To say nothing of* = om niet te spreken van. I tried to teach him French, but to *say nothing* of the shortness of the time he had I found him very unequal to it. Melodrama and novels, to *say nothing* of shilling shockers. (*Strand Mag.*, Sept. 1908 p. 276.) He would miss the sham bull-fight, to *say nothing* of the puppet-show. (Oscar Wilde, *Birthday of the Infanta*.) I won't guarantee that she'll weather even a Gravesend gale, *let alone* the mountainous waves of the mighty Atlantic. (*Harmsworth Magazine*, 1901. p. 576.) It is hard to get a gardener who can prune a gooseberry bush, *let alone* raise a cucumber (*Guardian*, Jan. 20, 1892). — *A grown up, an adult.* All the *grown-ups* would laugh at him for it. (Pearson's *Mag.*, Nov. 1920). Price's Night Light is an insurance against nocturnal alarms, a safe inexpensive illuminant. Its safe steady glow conveys a sense of security to child and adult alike. (Advertisement.).

9. *Go you in.* The subject of the imperative usually precedes its verb: *You notice the view from the windows!* (Said by an English guide.). *You go your way and I'll go mine* (P. White, *The Corner house* p. 43.). *But: Run you to the door!* (Hornung, *Raffles*, p. 227.). The inverted order may help to soften down the command. More examples are given in Kruisinga's *Handbook* § 2184. In the nature of things the subject is not expressed as a rule, as it always denotes the person addressed. When expressed it frequently marks a somewhat contemptuous emphasis in prohibitions e.g.: *Don't you throw out dirty water, till you get in fresh!* (B. Shaw, *Fanny's First Play*). *Don't you go and tell him the secret.* (Onions, *Advanced Syntax*, § 156.). — *If you can hit upon an excuse.* In the fittest words I could hit upon. (*Pearson's Mag.* Aug. 1901, p. 154.) He hit upon the following way of ridding himself of the annoyance. (*Strand Magazine*, April 1904. p. 480.). — *There's a good fellow.* Shove a bit of coal on, *there's a good chap* (J. D. Beresford, *Housemates*.). Well, you know best, but don't talk now, *there's a good fellow.* (G. Sims, *Tales of To-day*. p. 287.). Occasionally *there's* is followed by other expressions as in: "What was that noise, Nanny? Do tell me!" "Why, a train, of course. *There's a mollycoddle!* (Compton Mackenzie, *Sinister Street*, I. p. 3.).

10. *Good-hearted:* As Helen Adair, the *good-hearted*, high-spirited heroine, Miss Alma Taylor is full of life and happy laughter. (*Daily Mail*, Jan. 26. 1924.). — *Pretence* is usually found in a bad sense. A *pretence* is the holding forth of that which is false: as, his grief, admiration of a picture, piety, was all a *pretence*; selfish or ulterior purposes may be connected with the matter, but not necessarily so: as 'to obtain money under *false pretences*'. A *pretext* has something else in view, and makes it seem right or natural, or hides it out of sight; the man whose friendship is a mere *pretence* will trump up some *pretext* to escape from each claim upon him for help. That which is used as a *pretext* may or may not exist. (*Century Dictionary*.). — *Once more:* *Once more* in Mr. Coleman's bedroom Patsie locked the door behind him, and his brain and hands worked rapidly. (Jessie Pope, *Patsie's Christmas*.). — *Back in the nursery.*

11. *She had honestly endeavoured to be good.*

12. *Bobbed (dropped) a curtsy.* The little girl was on the very point of dropping a courtesy. (*Harper's Magazine*, Dec. 1912. p. 88.). I don't know what call she had to blush so when she *made her curtsy*. (Thackeray, *Virginians*, XXII.). *Bobs her an awkward curtsy.* (George Egerton, *Discords I*.). *Near the door — By the door — At the door.* The last two express closer proximity. Mr. R. white as a sheet was standing *at the door*. (Oppenheim, *Game of Liberty*.). *At the door* the two exchanged a kiss. (Pett Ridge, *Thanks to Sanderson*, p. 222.). Went out *at the opposite door*. (*Elizabeth and her German Garden*, p. 163.) The Doctor stood *by the door* to shake hands with them. (Anstey, *Vice Versa*.). Thus 'He sat by me' means 'close to me'. 'He sat near me' might indicate an intervening object or person. I tiptoed up to the door and looked through the crack *by the hinges*. (*Hutchinson's Magazine*, Dec. 1920. p. 614.). — *Doorway:* Appeared to be sheltering themselves from the wind *in the doorway* of a house. (*Strand Magazine*, Oct. 1903. p. 371.). Listening *in the doorway*. (*Times Weekly*, 24. 9. 1920.). The maid-servant was standing *in the doorway*. (*Strand Magazine*, Nov. 1906. p. 578.). "It's good", declared W. *at the doorway* (Pett Ridge, *Sanderson*, p. 225.). — *Replied prettily.* — *Informations after her health.* Wrong for two reasons! The word *information* never occurs in the plural and does not signify a request for enlightenment, as in Dutch.

*Keep the conversation going* is correct: I endeavoured to keep the conversation going. (*Strand Magazine*, X. 377).)

13. *What's the matter with the hedge.* — *Tartly*: "Don't you think father looks rather seedy?" "I've been thinking so a long time", said miss Pinnegar *tartly*. (D. H. Lawrence, *The Lost Girl*, Ch. VIII.). "You have no evidence that she wasn't respectable". "We have no evidence that she was", said Anna *tartly*. (Mrs. De la Pasture, *The Grey Knight*, p. 137.). — *He seemed to show not much interest.* *Not* is usually placed *before* the infinitive: I advise you *not* to do it. *Not* in a split infinitive: I don't see how you had the heart *to not* ask us. (Baroness von Hutten, *Pam*, p. 91.). She wanted *not* to vex people (E. M. Forster, *Howard's End*, p. 90.). "She did *not* want to vex people" would slightly affect the meaning. See Kruisinga, *Handbook*, § 335.

14. *Part* in the sense of essential or integral portion: Affection is *part* of insight. (Quoted from the Oxford Dictionary). O Queen, it is *part* of the art of war to be well prepared when in an enemy's camp. (Dunsany, *The Queen's Enemies*.).

15. *Ida thought she'd better keep silence (silent).* *Thought better to keep silent.* English usage requires that a noun clause or an infinitive playing the part of an object should be anticipated by *it*. In expressions like "He *thought fit* to interfere" the adjective and the verb form one idea.

16. *Bristly eyebrows*: hardly appropriate; the O.E.D. defines: set with bristles, or short stiff hairs. A *bristly* boar. — *He could scrutinize Ida.* This would be taken to mean that he was able or in a position to look keenly at Ida. — *Which made her lose all her presence of mind* is correct.

Good translations were received from Miss B., Ederveen; Mr. S. B., Middelburg; Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss A. H., Amsterdam; Mr. J. W. H., Almelo; Mr. J. H., Utrecht; Mr. J. H., Bergum; Miss Th. A. v. 't H., Utrecht; Miss L. v. I., Waalwijk; Miss M. J., Eindhoven; Miss B. J. v. K., Delft; Mr. F. C. A. K., 's-Hertogenbosch; Mr. J. L., Utrecht; Mr. J. L., Giessendam; Mr. H. v. L., Twijzelerheide; Mr. A. T. de M., Amsterdam; Sr. Ph., Oirschot; Mr. M. P., Rauwerd; Miss M. P., Utrecht; Miss H. W. S., Rotterdam; Miss T., Hilversum; Miss M. V., Leeuwarden; Mr. J. V., Rotterdam; Mr. P. W. K. Z., The Hague.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 94 Voorstraat, Brielle, before May 1st. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

### De Dief.

1. Van heel klein al had Gerrit er vermaak in gehad stil te stelen, juist op de gevaarlijkste plekken. 2. Nu nam hij alleen wat hem beviel, maar toen, nog jong, nam hij elk onbeheerd ding mee. 3. Telkens werd het hem toen afgenomen, kreeg hij duchtig ransel, omdat hij het nog niet goed wist te verbergen of handig genoeg weg te kapen. 4. Op later leeftijd werd hij voorzichtiger. 5. Hij leerde wachten met het geduld van een kat, die op een muis loert, tot hij de kans schoon zag en dan toespringen en alles vergeten, om te hebben, te hebben. 6. Eerst had hij, als eenmaal de dingen van hem waren, er niets meer voor gevoeld, maar weldra ging hij zijn schat zorgvuldig bewaren, wat een nieuwe hartstocht in zijn ziel wakker riep. 7. Hij kon zich geen rekenschap geven van dien drang om te stelen: zóó zag hij iets, zóó greep hij het, zonder na te denken of te aarzelen. 8. Langzamerhand stelde hij in niets anders meer belang. 9. Zijn grond ging elk jaar in waarde achteruit, zijn zoons bestalen hem, zijn hypotheek en schulden liepen op, zijn inkomsten verminderden. 10. Er was niets, dat hem bij zijn werk hield: z'n steellust ging hem boven alles . . . ontzettend van genot, van stil genot.



11. Eens had hij in een angstbui, die hem in zijn jonge jaren soms bekreep, aan dominé in het geheim bekend, dat hij dikwijls dingen wegnam, zoo alleen maar om ze te hebben. 12. De oude dominé had hem duchtig den mantel uitgeveegd en hem de deur gewezen. 13. Gerrit in zijn boersche domheid en blootheid had niets verder gezegd. 14. Kort daarop preekte dominé in de kerk tegen stelen, dreigde alle dieven met de hel en stelde hen voor als monsters van slechtheid. 15. Dat maakte Gerrit bijna dol van angst, vooral omdat de strenge oude dominee hem onder de preek voortdurend had aangekeken. 16. 'n Tijdje had Gerrit weerstand geboden aan de verleiding, maar zijn begeerte vrat al dieper in en liet hem geen rust. 17. Als hij iets zag, dat hij verlangde te bezitten, laaide de oude hartstocht weer op. 18. Dan de greep . . . 19. Als het gedaan was, voelde hij zich opgelucht; een weldadig gevoel verving de spanning. 20. Door dominee's gedreig had Gerrit er nooit meer tegen een mensch over durven praten, ofschoon hij bij tijden wel gewild had. 21. Alle weken ging hij stipt naar de kerk, alsof hij onweerstaanbaar erheen getrokken werd om te hooren, wat hem te wachten stond.

## Reviews.

*Convention and Revolt in Poetry.* By JOHN LIVINGSTONE LOWES, Professor of English in Harvard University. — Constable (or Houghton Mifflin). 1919 — 12/6.

A fine book, full of sound scholarship, and inspired by good taste, excellent sense and wide sympathies. A book to be warmly recommended to those whom the modern literary chaos threatens to strike with bewilderment. A book written in a clear and engaging style, proclaiming that the author, who is obviously an enemy of cryptic, pseudo-profound utterances, is completely one with his subject. Occasionally, indeed, he is somewhat timorous. He need not have so very eagerly desired 'to steer clear of metaphysics', 'the perilous edge of which' he keeps skirting so circumspectly. And though I am very loth to do so, I cannot but deplore the fact that Professor Lowes pays too much lip-service to that much-abused word *beauty*. Evidently Edgar Poe's spirit is mighty yet, and uses the professor as a medium when he writes: 'The end of art, whose essence is restraint, is not to make us grieve, or love, or hate, or flush with anger, or grow pale with rage. It is to stir us with the sense of an imperishable beauty. . . ' This is a position which I cannot possibly adopt. I agree that the essence of all art is restraint, but the object of an artist is the conveyance of his emotions, and if he succeeds in doing this with a minimum of apparent effort the result will as a matter of course be aesthetically satisfactory. A.E. Housman does not aim at stirring us with the sense of an imperishable beauty when he writes (*A Shropshire Lad*, XLIX, second stanza):

Oh, 't is jesting, dancing, drinking  
Spins the heavy world around.  
If young hearts were not so clever,  
Oh, they would be young forever:  
Think no more; 't is only thinking  
Lays lads underground.

Hardy does not want to stir us with the sense of imperishable beauty when dealing with a subject sadder than the Crucifixion itself, namely Peter's denial of Christ ('In the Servants' Quarters', Coll. Ed. page 359, 360):

"Man, you too, aren't you one of these rough followers of the criminal?  
All hanging here about to gather how he's going to bear  
Examination in the hall." She flung disdainful glances on  
The shabby figure standing at the fire with others there,  
Who warmed them by its flare.

. . . . .

"No! I'll be damned in hell if I know anything about the man!  
 No single thing about him more than every body knows!  
 Must not I even warm my hands but I am charged with blasphemies?"  
 — His face convulses as the morning cock that moment crows,  
 And he droops, and turns, and goes.

And when Wilfrid Gibson writes an excellent poem on the *evil eye*, his object is not to stir us with the sense of imperishable beauty any more than is Adriaen Brouwer's when painting a drunken, brutalized boor. Let me quote again ('Neighbours', page 23: Blind Bell):

Like a wind-written ash  
 On a rime-grizzled moor,  
 Corpse-cold in the shade  
 Beside the church-door,

She stood with a grin  
 As we trod, newly-wed,  
 The slimy green path  
 By the mounds of the dead.

As her blank eyes bleared out  
 From her pocked yellow face  
 Like a moon on the wane,  
 We slackened our pace.

As her cruel blind eyes  
 Peered into each heart,  
 We faltered and trailed  
 Unlinked and apart,

Till estranged and corpse-cold  
 We stood at our door,  
 Each lone as an ash  
 On a rime-grizzled moor.

So much for the principal hole, I might almost say the one hole, in Prof. Lowes' armour. His discussion of the poets' attitude towards conventions, of poetic diction, of *vers libre*, of prose versus poetry, are beyond praise. Incidentally I may observe that he freely uses the expression *to belong together*, which makes not a few English purists 'see red', and even to *belong asunder*. Also that he quotes a certain proverb in this way: 'the proof of [the] pudding is the eating of it'. I remember being taken to task some years ago for likewise omitting *in* before *the eating*.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

---

*Walt Whitman: The Prophet of the New Era.* By WILL HAYES.  
 London: C. W. Daniel. 1921. — 4/6 net.

The appeal of this persuasively written book is not literary, it is religious. It is concerned far less with Whitman the poet than with Whitman the prophet, or would-be prophet. The cult it preaches has nothing in common with 'Rupert Brooke' worship or 'James Elroy Flecker' *latreia*. Walt Whitman is one of the great initiated. He is of the company of Gautama and Zarathustra, of Mohammed, and of Jesus, most especially of Jesus, and he is confidently announced as the Christ of Our Age.

The claim will be considered sacrilegious by any one who sees in Jesus of Nazareth the incarnation of divine perfection, the redeemer of mankind, the mediator between sinful humanity and God. To a level-headed observer

the close parallels which the author draws between Jesus' life and Whitman's will seem strained to a degree. There have been more carpenters and more friends of publicans and sinners. The Sermon on the Mount is an altogether different thing from the 'Song of Myself'. Is any of Whitman's parables on the same plane with the 'Good Samaritan' or the 'Prodigal Son'? Does his exceedingly short career as a wound-dresser in the American Civil War justify us in attributing to Whitman the so-called *healing touch*? And suppose it does, are not the majority of mothers endowed with the same pain-expelling power? Where is the merit?

Christ suffered on the cross. Whitman lived to a ripe old age, in fairly easy circumstances, coddled and made much of by admiring friends. It is true, he once lost a government job because of his poems, and he suffered ridicule likewise, but I am not prepared to call this sort of thing crucifixion. As regards his 'sympathetic' sufferings my position is equally negative.

"Not a mutineer walks handcuffed to jail but I am handcuffed to him and walk by his side . . . . ."

"Not a youngster is taken for larceny but I go up too, and am tried and sentenced."

"Not a cholera patient lies at the last gasp but I also lie at the last gasp, 'My face is ash-colored, my sinews gnarl, away from me people retreat.'"

These are grand words, but I remember a sentence somewhere in Meredith to the effect that "sentimental people sleep well and live long; it is *feeling* that is the slayer." Whitman was seventy-two years old when he died . . . . .

In his life-time he was as fond of pose as Byron himself, and as consciously picturesque as Joaquin Miller. Though disciples were easily persuaded that he was a perfect man, the son of a perfect mother, the truth is that he came of tainted stock. One of his brothers died in a lunatic asylum; the youngest (Edward) was an incurable idiot. And himself! A man who wants to lie 'with my head in your lap, camarado' will always strike the average Hollander as peculiar. Surely this is not exactly a masculine way of expressing 'the manly love of comrades'. To find this done one has to go to certain sections of *A Shropshire Lad*, especially XXXVII.

Whitman is, at his best, a great literary artist. Though negligible as a thinker — original ideas he has none — and in spite of his formlessness and his eternal catalogues, he is an undoubted master as regards transferring emotion. — His Messianic mission has been dealt with, and to my mind disposed of, once for all, by the inevitable German<sup>1</sup>).

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

---

*The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. With an Introduction and Notes by J. H. SCHUTT. Kemink & Zoon, Utrecht, 1923. Sewed f 1.75. Cloth f 2.05.

This is an excellent little book. It quite comes up to the high standard of Grondhoud and Roorda's and Eykman and Voortman's annotated editions as regards the accuracy of the definitions and statements and, like the other books that have appeared in the series: *Selections from English Literature*, it is on a higher level than the books of the older series in that it gives an ably written literary introduction and a more scientific treatment of the text, both as regards the editing and the explanation of difficult passages.

<sup>1</sup>) *Der Yankee-Heiland*. Ein Beitrag zur modernen Religionsgeschichte. Von Eduard Bertz. — Dresden 1906.



"An edition of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde for schools needs no defence", says Mr. Schutt in the preface. We are afraid that many teachers will not agree, unless Mr. S. means an edition for school libraries. For class-reading the text is, in our opinion, too difficult. This and the scholarliness of the introduction and the notes makes the book far more suitable for students reading for the A or B examinations than for the boys and girls of an H. B. S.

For his introduction Mr. Schutt has made use of the best works bearing on his subject and made a careful study of many other important works by Stevenson. The titles of these works and of his authorities are given in footnotes. He successively deals with the author's life, his character, Stevenson as a writer, his style, Stevenson as a writer of short stories and *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*.

In his short essay Mr. Schutt has accomplished what, according to Sir Sidney Lee, *Principles of Biography*, (Cambridge: at the University, 1911) ought to be the aim of all biography: he has described graphically both the personality and the achievement of his subject and he has shown, so far as it is possible to do so, that Stevenson's career satisfies the conditions, which according to the same great authority a "fit theme of biography" ought to satisfy, viz. that it is: "serious, complete and of a certain magnitude".

The introduction proves that Mr. Schutt has very ably availed himself of "the unrestricted opportunities of literary skill . . . which biography gives". He has moreover shown how *The Strange Case* originated and grew under the influence of its author's experience and personality, and has added a very skilful criticism of the story.

In the notes Mr. Schutt has "also drawn the pupil's or the teacher's attention to questions of syntax and style, or more rarely, of literary art". The notes have been compiled with minute, some of them perhaps with over-minute care and they are both clever and suggestive. The notes also give the deviations from the original text, the text printed being that of the edition revised by Sidney Colvin.

A key to the phonetic symbols and an alphabetical list of the words dealt with in the notes will be very welcome in the next edition for which there will be very little to correct or alter.

P. XI, l. 20. of? from?

p. 40, 8 *haggard*, when used of persons, generally expresses much more than wild-looking, and in *a haggard shaft of daylight* the word does not suggest that "the beam of light had no business to be there", but that it was pale, thin and cheerless.

p. 43, 1 *but for*, 'except for' might also have been given.

p. 45, 2 [læbərætəri] should be [læbərətəri].

p. 46, 7 [kæbinet] " " [kæbinit].

p. 46, 11 Is the predicative use of *sick* in the sense of 'very ill', really so rare in literary English?

p. 49, 6 *hoarse*, explained p. 25, 3.

p. 50, 9 Attention might have been drawn to the peculiar use of *on the wing*, which usually means: "flying, travelling, in motion".

p. 83, 11 The progressive form does *not* serve to indicate that this happened very often. It serves to express emotion on the part of the speaker. See v. d. Laan's Dissertation on the Progressive Form, Duym, Gorinchem, 1922, p. 40.

p. 89, 3 might? should?

- p.111, 1 *the stamping efficacy* — the power of shaping the body and impressing it with a character?  
 p.115, 2 *trimming the midnight lamp*, evidently modelled on the more familiar: burning the midnight oil. It is, of course, impossible to draw the attention to every instance of Stevenson's avoidance of the commonplace.

J. v. D.

*Oor die Ontstaan van Afrikaans.* Door Dr. D. B. BOSMAN.  
 Swets & Zeitlinger, Amsterdam. 1923. f 3.25.

The development of Afrikaans has attracted a great deal of attention in the last twenty years. It is naturally the Afrianders themselves who have taken a large and honourable part in these discussions. But the Dutch scholars who have treated the question are chiefly such as devote their main energies in other fields than the history of Dutch. This is natural, for the history of Afrikaans is valuable for its bearing on the development of language in general. And it is this peculiarity which explains why we think it right to draw the attention of our readers to the book of Dr. Bosman.

When we consider the structure of Afrikaans we find a language that has lost a great deal of the appearance of an Indogermanic language. It shares this peculiarity with English, and it is therefore natural that scholars should have looked for the same causes in explanation of the development of both: the influence of the mixture of languages. When, in 1899, Dr. Hesseling published a book (*Het Afrikaans*, E. J. Brill, Leiden) in which he attempted to show that the foreign language responsible for the difference between Afrikaans and Dutch was the Malay Portuguese that used to be spoken there, he found most scholars ready to accept his conclusion. As late as 1906 Professor Muller in the *Museum* declared that the discovery was like the egg of Columbus: „ja, achteraf beschouwd, verbazen wij ons thans bijna, dat men niet eer aan dezen, immers eenig mogelijken, oorsprong van het Afrikaansch heeft gedacht”. In the same year I published an article in *Taal & Letteren* (Vol. 16, p. 417-439) in which I examined the linguistic and historical arguments of Dr. Hesseling. My conclusion was that the linguistic evidence was absolutely insufficient to bear the superstructure of Hesseling's theory, and that the historical arguments for the early date of most changes were equally unsatisfactory. Dr. Hesseling answered in the following number of *Taal & Letteren*, declaring himself unconvinced by my arguments. Since that date the question has been treated in some doctors' dissertations; the most important is perhaps the one by Dr. Bosman. This dissertation met with so much success that it ran out of print, which induced the author to publish a new edition. The book before us is, however, much more than a reprint or a revised edition, and the author was therefore justified in offering it as a new book.

Dr. Bosman discusses with great fullness the two theories that had been brought forward: the Malay-Portuguese of Professor Hesseling, and the spontaneous development by myself. Both are found wanting. But the result is by no means purely destructive: the author gives his own explanation on p. 101 in these words: “In so ver as Afrikaans nie die spontane ontwikkeling van Hollands is nie, is dit 'n ontwikkeling van Hollands hoofsaaklik onder invloed van die Nederlands van vreemdelinge”. The conclusion is not very different from what the author had said in his dissertation, but it is supported by a fuller and more convincing array of arguments, chiefly of an historical character.

The result seems likely to be generally accepted. As for myself, I am willing to take leave of my own theory: I am satisfied if my article has done its work of clearing the ground by showing the unsatisfactory character of the linguistic arguments adduced by Dr. Hesseling. It seems that Dr. Hesseling is more attached to his own discovery,<sup>1)</sup> but I am pretty certain that he is fighting for a lost cause. In this respect I think it a significant fact that Professor Van Ginneken, who in his *Handboek der Nederlandsche Taal* fully accepted Hesseling's theory, expressed himself as follows in 1917 (i.e. a year after Bosman's dissertation) on p. 196 of the *Regenboogkleuren van Nederlands Taal*: „Op de taal dezer kolonisten was van zekeren invloed het Maleisch-Portugeesch, dat uit Indië werd overgebracht door koelies, baboes en ander Indisch dienstpersoneel. Ook de uit Indië aangevoerde slaven en de uit Indië naar de Kaap verbannen rebelsche vorsten met hun hofstoet hielpen misschien mede aan de verbreiding van genoemde taal. Toch is de invloed dezer taal niet zeer groot geweest, en zeker niet te vergelijken met de rol die het Maleisch-Portugeesch in Oost-Indië heeft gespeeld . . . . . De Creoliseering van het Afrikaansch is misschien voor een klein gedeelte ook een gevolg van den invloed van het Maleisch-Portugeesch. Maar de overal werkende oorzaak: de taaldooreenhaspeling van allerlei Europeanen, Indiërs en Afrikanen was hiervan zeker de voorname drijfkracht.”

A conclusion similar to this may prove to be the means of settling the long quarrel among students of English with regard to the influence of French.

E. KRUISINGA.

---

*The Place Names of Lancashire.* By E. EK WALL. Manchester, 1922. Publications of the University of Manchester, no. CXLIX. (English Ser., no. XI). XV + 280 Ss. gr. 80.

Unter den zahlreichen arbeiten, die im laufe der letzten jahrzehnte den englischen ortsnamen gewidmet worden sind, nimmt das vorliegende buch des professors der englischen philologie zu Lund jedenfalls nach umfang und inhalt einen hervorragenden platz ein. Wie der verfasser im vorwort berichtet, hatte er schon vor zwölf jahren mit der ausarbeitung begonnen und sein werk war bereits in einem vorgeschrittenen stadium, als das gleichnamige von Wyld und Hirst erschien (London 1911), dem bald darauf Sephton's *Handbook of Lancashire Place-names* (Liverpool 1913) folgte. Ich kenne diese beiden bücher nicht, aber nach dem was E. in der einleitung S. 1 ff. über dieselben sagt<sup>2)</sup>, können wir uns nur freuen, dasz er seinen plan trotz dieser veröfentlichungen ausgeführt hat. Der weltkrieg hat das erscheinen verzögert und erst in den jahren 1920 u. 1921 war es dem verfasser möglich, einige monate im lande selbst zuzubringen und die betreffenden örtlichkeiten in augenschein zu nehmen. Die lage eines ortes konnte nicht selten über die erklärung eines zweifelhaften namens entscheiden.

Die einleitung beginnt mit einer umfassenden bibliographie in der vielleicht noch die bücher von Gröhler, (Ursprung u. Bedeutung der franz. Ortsnamen, Samml. roman. Elementar- u. Handbücher, V, 2), Solmsen (Indogermanische Eigennamen, Heidelberg 1922), Ritter (Vermischte Beiträge zur engl. Sprachgeschichte, Halle 1922) und Sandbach (Die Schönhengster Ortsnamen,

<sup>1)</sup> *Museum*, November 1923.

<sup>2)</sup> Vgl. auch seine anzeige von Wyld-Hirst im *Beiblatt zur Anglia* 23, 177 ff., sowie diejenige Björkman's in den *Engl. Stud.* 44, 249 ff.



Heidelberg, Slavica, 6) nachzutragen wären. Dann bespricht E. die früheren werke über denselben gegenstand und verbreitet sich des näheren über plan und umfang seines buches. Es soll nicht bloss die etymologie der einzelnen ortsnamen in geographischer ordnung geben, sondern auch die verteilung der namentypen und die art der siedlung (Kelten, Engländer, Skandinavien) zeigen; auch gibt der verfasser die heutige aussprache der namen an, obgleich diese nicht immer von besonderem wert ist. Sodann werden die elemente der ortsnamen in alphabetischer reihenfolge und in den ältesten englischen oder nordischen formen vorgeführt (von *á* bis *wudu*). Eine kurze darlegung der lautlehre des dialekts von Lancashire beschliesst dieses einleitende kapitel.

Im hauptteil seines werkes führt E. die einzelnen namen mit den belegen aus den verschiedenen jahrhunderten vor, um dann eine etymologische deutung zu versuchen. Sind die namen aus sehr alter zeit überliefert, so ist die erklärang gewöhnlich leicht und sicher; liegen aber erst spätere formen aus urkunden und geschichtswerken vor, so entstehen häufig zweifel, zuweilen ist jede etymologie unmöglich. Es gewährt einen eignen reiz, zu sehen, wie die namen im laufe der zeit oft verunstaltet und entstellt werden — gerade wie in anderen ländern. Hätte man die alten belege nicht, dann wäre meist jede deutung unmöglich.

Eine zusammenfassung der ergebnisse (S. 224 ff.) behandelt die Britten, Angeln und Skandinavien in Lancashire, soweit sich deren wohnsitze aus den ortsnamen ergeben. Hier hat der verf. einige wichtige tatsachen durch sprachliche kriterien ermittelt z.b. dass im nördl. teile der grafenschaft Nordhumbrier, im südl. aber Merkwier wohnten, der Ribble also die grenze bildete. Neben vorwiegend norwegischen namen erscheinen auch einige dänische, was auf, wenigstens teilweise, besiedelung durch Dänen schliessen lässt.

Zum schluss führt der verf. diejenigen namen vor, die kulturhistorischer bedeutung sind, d.h. sich auf alte strassen, gebäude, soziale einrichtungen, klassen, personen, flora und fauna, landbau und volkskunde beziehen. Ein alphabetischer index beschliesst das ausgezeichnete buch, das als muster für ähnliche untersuchungen bezeichnet werden darf.

Kiel.

F. HOLTHAUSEN.

## Bibliography.

### POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*Layamon's Brut*. Selections, edited with introduction, notes and glossary, by JOSEPH HALL. Pp. xx + 150. Milford, 1924. 6/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Cavalier and Puritan*. Ballads and Broad-sides illustrating the period of the Great Rebellion 1640–1660. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by HYDER E. ROLLINS. 9 1/2 × 6 1/2, xv. + 532 pp. New York: University Press.

*The Complete Poetical Works of Austin Dobson*. (The Oxford Poets.) 8 × 5 1/4. xxiii + 325 pp. Milford, 1924. 7 s. net.

*The Best Poems of 1923*. Selected by THOMAS MOULT. Decorated by PHILIP HAGREEN. 7 1/4 × 5 1/4, 135 pp. Jonathan Cape, 1924. 6 s. net.

*Poetry in Australia*. 1923. Preface by NORMAN LINDSAY. 8 × 5 1/2, xiii. + 143 pp. Sydney: Vision Press. 1924.

*A Book of Australian Verse*. Chosen by WALTER MURDOCH. 7 1/2 × 5 1/4, viii. + 287 pp. Milford, 1924. 4 s. net.

*A Cure of Souls*. A Novel. By MAY SINCLAIR. 7 1/4 × 5 1/4, 288 pp. Hutchinson. 7 s. 6 d. net.

*Undream'd of Shores*. By FRANK HARRIS. 7 1/4 × 5 1/4, 297 pp. Grant Richards, 1924. 7/6 n.

*Celestina*, or the Tragi-Comedy of Calisto and Melibea. Translated from the Spanish by JAMES MABBE. Also an Interlude of Calisto and Melebea. The whole edited, with appendices and an introduction on the Picaresque Novel, by H. WARNER ALLEN. (Broadway Translations.)  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xci. + 345 pp. Routledge. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*The Tragical History of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke*. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxi. + 73 pp. Bodley Head Quartos. John Lane, 1924. 3 s. net.

A reprint of the First Quarto. Introduction by G. B. Harrison.

*The Lady of Belmont*. A Play in Five Acts. By ST. JOHN G. ERVINE.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , 95 pp. Allen and Unwin. 1924. 3 s. 6 d. net.

*Ayuli*: A Play in Three Acts and an Epilogue. By LAURENCE BINYON. 103 pp. *The Prince*. By GWEN JOHN. 88 pp. *Four One-Act Plays*. 125 pp. *The Lilies of the Field*: A Comedy in Three Acts. By JOHN HASTINGS TURNER. 116 pp.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . Oxford: Blackwell, 1924. 3 s. 6 d. net each.

#### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*Beowulfskalden och nordisk tradition*. By C. W. VON SYDOW. Yearbook of the New Society of Letters at Lund. 1923. pp. 77-91.

*Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*: A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism. By DONALD LEMEN CLARK.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , x. + 166 pp. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Milford. 9 s. net.

In this study, published in the United States in 1922, the author, who is Assistant Professor of English in Columbia University, seeks to trace the influence of classical rhetoric on the criticisms of poetry published in England between 1553 and 1641. [T.]

*John Davies of Hereford (1565?-1618) und sein Bild von Shakespeares Umgebung*. By HANS HEIDRICH. Palaestra cxliii. Roy. 8vo. vi. + 124 pp. Leipzig: Mayer u. Müller, 1924.

*James Harrington's Oceana*. Edited with Notes by S. B. LILJEGREN. Publications of the New Society of Letters at Lund. 4. Heidelberg 1924. Carl Winter. xxiii + 372 pp. Price 10 Swedish crowns.

*De Nederlandsche Vertalingen en Navolgingen van Thomson's Seasons*. Door B. G. HALBERSTADT. Frankenstein & Wagner, Leipzig. 1923. viii. + 170.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*Das Ausland in Smolletts Romanen*. By ERNA SCHUDT. Roy. 8vo, iv. + 35 pp. Giessen: Selbstverlag des Engl. Seminars, 1923.

*Robert Burns*: An Address delivered to the Ninety Burns Club of Edinburgh, January 25, 1924. By JOHN DRINKWATER.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 18 pp. Edinburgh: Messrs. James Thin.

*Wordsworth's "Prelude"*. By THE RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT GREY OF FALLODON, K.G.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 15 pp. English Association (4, Buckingham-gate, S. W. 1.) 1 s.

Lord Grey's Presidential Address before the English Association on May 26 last year.

*Byron, the Poet*. Edited by WALTER A. BRISCOE. A Collection of Addresses and Essays. A Centenary Volume.  $9 \times 6$ , xvi. + 288 pp. Routledge. 1924. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*Byron*: The Last Journey, April, 1823-April, 1824. By HAROLD NICOLSON.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xiii. + 288 pp. Constable. 1924. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*Byron in England*. His Fame and After-Fame. By SAMUEL C. CHEW.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , ix. + 415 pp. Murray. 1924. 21 s. net.

*La Vie de Lord Byron*. Par ROGER BOUTET DE NOUVEL. Paris, Plon. 1924. 12 fr.

*Byron. 1788-1824*. Par E. RODOCANACHI. Paris, Hachette. 1924. 12 fr.

*Letters of Anne Thackeray Ritchie*. With Forty-two Additional Letters from her Father, WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. Selected and Edited by Her Daughter, HESTER RITCHIE.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , x. + 314 pp. Murray. 1924. 15 s. net.

*Brontë Moors and Villages, from Thornton to Haworth*. By ELIZABETH SOUTHWART. John Lane, 1923. 15/- net.

*Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold*. Edited by ARNOLD WHITRIDGE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 70 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 6s. 6d. n.

*Robert Browning. Poet and Philosopher, 1850-1889*. By FRANCES M. SIM.  $9 \times 6$ , 251 pp. Fisher Unwin. 1923. 10s. 6d. n.

*Taine et l'Angleterre*. Par F. C. ROE. Thèse de doctorat. Paris, 1923.

*Freiligraths Übersetzungen englischer Dichtungen*. By FRIEDR. AUG. ROESCHEN. 8vo, 30 pp. Giessen: Engl. Seminar d. Univ., 1923.

*Selected Essays of Robert Louis Stevenson*. With Introduction and Notes by H. G. RAWLINSON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xxii. + 188 pp. Oxford University Press. 4s. 6d. n.

*The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson.* By ROSALINE MASSON.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xiii.+358 pp. Chambers. 10s. 6d. n.

*R. L. Stevenson: A Critical Study.* 195 pp. *George Gissing: A Critical Study.* 200 pp. By FRANK SWINNERTON.  $8 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ . Martin Secker. 1924. 7s. 6d.

First published in 1914.

*George Meredith: les cinquante premières années (1828-1878).* Par RENÉ GALLAND, docteur ès lettres. Pp. xv.+430. Paris, Les Presses Universitaires, 1923. [A review will appear.]

*George Meredith and British Criticism (1851-1909).* Par RENÉ GALLAND. Pp. xii.+120. Paris, Les Presses Universitaires, 1923. [A review will appear.]

*Das Naturgefühl bei Thomas Hardy im Zusammenhang mit seiner Weltanschauung.* By OTTO KARL MÜLLER. M.S. Diss., Jena, 1923. Summary 1923, 8vo, 2 pp.

*Die englische Literatur des 19. u. 20. Jahrhunderts.* By BERNHARD FEHR. Part IV. Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Lief. 8. 4to, 32 pp. Berlin-Neubabelsberg: Athenaion 1923.

*Der Zionismus in der englischen Literatur.* By PAUL SILBERSTEIN. MS Diss., Greifswald 1923. Summary 1923. 8vo, 4 pp.

*Essays on Poetry.* By J. C. SQUIRE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 228 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1923. 7s. 6d. n.

Most of the articles in this volume are brought together from the columns of the *Observer* and the *London Mercury*.

*The English Secret: And Other Essays.* By BASIL DE SELINCOURT.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 173 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. Milford. 1923. 10s. 6d. n.

*H. G. Wells.* By IVOR BROWN. (Writers of the Day Series.)  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , 128 pp. Nisbet 2s. n.

*Pencilings.* Little Essays on Literature. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ , viii.+277 pp. Collins. 7s. 6d. net.

*The Life of Olive Schreiner.* By S. C. CRONWRIGHT-SCHREINER.  $9 \times 6$ . xiv. + 414 pp. Fisher Unwin. 1924. 21s. n.

*Arnold Bennett.* By F. J. HARVEY DARTON. (New and Revised Edition.)  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 128 pp. Nisbet. 1924. 2s. net.

*Notes on Life and Letters.* By JOSEPH CONRAD. (Uniform Edition.)  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , x. + 262 pp. Dent. 1924. 10s. 6d. net.

This volume completes Messrs. Dent's Uniform Edition of Mr. Conrad's works. Any subsequent and hitherto unpublished works will be added in due course. [T]

*Proceedings of the British Academy.* 1919-1920.  $10 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xiv. + 496 pp. For the British Academy. Milford, 1924. 40s. net.

Among the literary papers here reprinted may be mentioned those of Dr. Farnell on the value and methods of mythologic study, of Sir Charles Holmes on Leonardo da Vinci, of Mr. George Saintsbury on recent studies in English prosody, of Sir A. W. Ward on Shakespeare and the "Makers of Virginia", of Mr. John Bayley on "Poetry and Commonplace", of the late Mr. Bernard Bosanquet on Croce's Aesthetic, and of Professor H. J. C. Grierson on Byron, Arnold, and Swinburne. [T]

*A Short History of American Literature.* Edited by WILLIAM PETERFIELD TRENT, JOHN ERSKINE, STUART P. SHERMAN, and CARL VAN DOREN. With an Introduction by CARL VAN DOREN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 428 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1924. 15s. net.

An abridged rearrangement of the Cambridge History of American Literature in four volumes, the chapters being the work of various collaborators. Bibliographical notes, general and for each chapter, at the end. Index 14 pp. [T]

*Nationalism and Imagism in Modern American Poetry.* By R. F. JONES. Reprinted from Washington University Studies, vol. XI, Humanistic Series, No. 1, pp. 97-130, 1923.

*The Mummerys' Play.* By the late R. J. E. TIDY. With A Memoir.  $9 \times 6$ , pp. 258. Milford, 1923. 14/- net.

*The Theory of Poetry.* By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 221 pp. Martin Secker. 1924. 5s. net.

These studies in the theory of poetry are based on the author's lectures on the subject in the Universities of Liverpool and Leeds. The argument has been considerably elaborated on the one hand, and on the other a good deal of the illustrative quotation has been omitted. [T]

*John Masefield.* A Study by CECIL BIGGANE. Heffer, 1924. Pp. 53. 2/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*The Profession of Poetry.* By H. W. GARROD. Milford, 1924. 1/6 net.

The inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on Feb. 13, 1924, by the newly elected Professor of Poetry, who succeeds the late W. P. Ker.

*Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association.* Vol. IX. Collected by the late W. P. KER. Clarendon Press, 1924. pp. 144. 7/6 net.

Contents: I The Trojans in Britain, by GEORGE GORDON. II The Original Language of the *Ancien Rêve*, by DOROTHY M. E. DYMES. III Long Will, Dante, and the Righteous Heathen, by R. W. CHAMBERS. IV The Life of Christ in the Ballads, by EDITH C. BATHO. V Joseph Warton, by EDITH J. MORLEY. VI On the Teaching of Case, by J. H. G. GRATTAN. VII The Modern Consciousness in English Literature, by BARKER FAIRLEY.



## LANGUAGE, HISTORY, BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*Distribution of Dialect Characters in Middle English.* By MARY S. SERJEANTSON. 34 pp. Amsterdam, Swets & Zeitlinger, 1924.

A reprint of the article in *ES*. vol IV, 1922.

*The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt.* A phonological, morphological, etymological, semasiological and textual study. By J. K. WALLENBERG. Inaugural Dissertation. Uppsala 1923. XVIII + 348 pp.

*Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts.* Edited by O. H. PRIOR. *Poem on the Assumption.* Edited by J. P. STRACHEY. *Poem on the Day of Judgment.* Edited by H. J. CHAYLOR. *Divisiones Mundi.* Edited by O. H. PRIOR. 9 × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xxviii + 66 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1924. 7s. 6d. n.

The first volume to be issued by the Cambridge Anglo-Norman Society contains three texts, each edited with introduction and notes, and representative of three *genres*; a purely didactic poem on geography, a legend of the Virgin, and a Biblical subject. The whole is prefaced by a sketch of the language and its history by Professor O. H. Prior. [T.]

*An English Grammar for Dutch Students.* By E. KRUISINGA. Vol. I: A Shorter Accidence and Syntax. 3rd ed. Kemink, Utrecht, 1924. XIV + 240. f 3.50.

*Logic and Grammar.* By OTTO JESPERSEN. *Great and Little Britain.* By D. MACRITCHIE and W. H. STEVENSON. S.P.E. Tract No. xvi. Correspondence and Report. 9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 6<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 40 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Milford. 1924. 3s. 6d. n.

*Englische Stilistik.* By PHILIPP ARONSTEIN. 8 vo, VIII + 194 pp. Leipzig: Teubner 1924.

*Concerning Certain Great Teachers of the English Language.* An inaugural lecture delivered in University College, London. By R. W. CHAMBERS. 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, 24 pp. Arnold. 1s.

The Quain Professor of English at University College, London, here writes principally of three of the great leaders in the study of the English language—Morley in London, Earle in Oxford, and Skeat in Cambridge. He vigorously defends them against certain strictures in the Report on the Teaching of English in England, denying both that they were under the influence of German ideas and methods, and that in their study of Anglo-Saxon they divorced language from literature and history. [T.]

*The Roxburghshire Word-Book: Being a Record of the Special Vernacular Vocabulary of the County of Roxburgh, with an Appendix of Specimens.* By GEORGE WATSON. 9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 6, viii. + 344 pp. Cambridge University Press 1923. 20s. n.

"A record of the special vernacular" — that is to say, not a full vocabulary, but a collection of distinctive terms, past and present, with a vocabulary of 300 pages giving every word current in the shire that is not standard English or generally Scottish. A bibliographical list contains a hundred authorities from 1619 to 1922. [T.]

*An Essex Dialect Dictionary.* By EDWARD GEPP. (Second Edition revised.) 9 × 6, 198 pp. Routledge. 10s. 6d. n.

The first ed. was reviewed in *ES*. III, 28.

*Relative Frequency of English Speech Sounds.* By GODFREY DEWEY. 9 × 6, xii. + 148 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

The object of this study is to determine the relative frequency of occurrence in good English, as written and spoken to-day, of the various simple sounds and commoner sound combinations, syllables and words, of the English language. The work adopts throughout a system of phonetic spelling. [T.]

*Wortschatz und Wirtschaft im Grossbritannischen Kriegseingliſch.* By WILHELM EICHLER. Diss., Greifswald, 1923, 8vo, 36 pp.

*The Cries of London.* By W. ROBERTS. With an Introduction by C. REGINALD GRUNDY. 12<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, x. + 14 pp. and 13 Plates. *The Connoisseur*. 1924. 15s. net.

*Readings in English Social History.* From pre-Roman days to A.D. 1837. Edited by R. B. MORGAN. 9 × 6<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xxx. + 585 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1923. 6s. n.

*Mediaeval England.* A New Edition of Barnard's "Companion to English History". Edited by H. W. C. DAVIS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1924. 21s. net.

*The Christmas Prince.* Printed for the Malone Society, at the Oxford University Press.

Edited by Dr. F. S. Boas and Dr. W. W.-Greg. A 17th c. MS. giving a full account of the revels at St. John's College, Oxford, in the winter of 1607 to 1608. Includes six Latin and three English Plays.

*Peeps at English Folk-Dances.* By VIOLET ALFORD. 7<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, viii. + 88 pp. Black. 3s. n.

This is an excellent short account of the English sword dance, Morris, maypole, and country dances. It is concerned more with history and interpretation and less with the actual figures, for which the reader is referred to Mr. Cecil Sharp's various collections. The author brings out well the sacrificial origin of the sword dance, in which there is a representation of a decapitation. It is a survival, of course, of a death and revival ritual such as enters also into the Mummers' Play. The section on country dancers is equally interesting. The author shows how the beautiful English country dances spread all over Europe, and pleads for their revival in place of the "tuneless clamour" of to-day. [T.]

*Seven XVIII<sup>th</sup> Century Bibliographies.* John Armstrong, William Shenstone, Mark Akenside, Oliver Goldsmith, William Collins, Charles Churchill, Richard Brinsley Sheridan. By IOLO A. WILLIAMS. 9 × 6, 244 pp. Dulau. 1924. 18s. net.

*The Year's Work in English Studies, 1922.* Edited for the English Association by SIR SIDNEY LEE and F. S. BOAS. 9 × 6, 221 pp. Milford. 1924. 7s. 6d. net.

*The English Catalogue of Books for 1923.* Giving in One Alphabet Under Author and Title the Size, Price, Month of Publication, and Publisher of Books Issued in the United Kingdom. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ , 414 pp. *Publishers' Circular*, 1924.

*A Bibliography of the Works of Rudyard Kipling (1881-1923).* By E. W. MARTINDELL. (A new edition much enlarged.) 9 × 6. xvi. + 222 pp. J. Lane. 1923. 25s. n.

First published in 1922. The present edition contains much new matter, including the particulars and dates of Mr. Kipling's Indian work for which the author has searched the files of the *Civil and Military Gazette* (Lahore), *The Pioneer* and the *Pioneer Mail* (Allahabad). [T.]

*The Library of Edmund Gosse.* Being a Descriptive and Bibliographical Catalogue of a portion of his collection. Compiled by E. H. M. COX. With an Introductory Essay by Mr. Gosse. 9 × 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ , 300 pp. Dulau. 1924. 18s. net.

*Catalogue of the Library of San'ki Ichikawa*, Professor of English Philology in the Imperial University of Tokyo. Part I: English and Comparative Philology. vii. + 194 pp. Tokyo, 1924. Privately printed.

#### PERIODICALS.

**De Drie Talen.** Bundel uitgegeven bij den aanvang van den 40<sup>en</sup> jaargang. English Section: J. Bouten, A few general remarks about ballad poetry in English literature (113-117). — G. A. Dudok, Iets over de Brontës (119-126). — J. A. Falconer, Celt and Saxon in England (127-135). — P. Fijn van Draat, Detached: Detachment (137-142). — W. van der Gaaf, The infinitive and the present participle in connection with verbs of perception (143-153). — E. Kruisinga, Methoden van spraakkunststudie (155-160). — Th. Neervens, S. J., To the Editor of "De Drie Talen" (161-165). — Fr. A. Pompen, Over Verbal Nouns (167-173). — H. Poutsma, Observations on expedients to express intensity and emphasis (175-187). — J. H. Schutt, Enige opmerkingen over het onderwys in de moderne talen (189-199).

**Modern Language Review.** XIX, 1. Jan. 1924. A. B. Taylor, On the History of Old English *ēa*, *eo* in Middle Kentish. — H. Dugdale Sykes, John Ford, the author of *The Spanish Gypsy*. — W. J. Lawrence, Was Peter Cunningham a Forger? — V. M. Jeffery, Italian and English Pastoral Drama of the Renaissance.

**The Quarterly Review.** No. 478. Jan. 1924. Lord Ernle, Our English Villages. — R. M. Gunmere, Matthew Arnold. — J. H. Morgan, The Personality of Lord Morley.

**The Criterion.** II, 5. Oct. 1923. W. P. Ker, Byron. — W. J. Lawrence, A New Shakespearian Text. — *Id.* II, 6. Febr. 1924. T. S. Eliot, Four Elizabethan Dramatists (Webster, Tourneur, Middleton, Chapman) I. — J. H. Robertson, Evolution of English Blank Verse.

**Contemporary Review.** No. 697. Jan. 1924. C. K. Allen, Joseph Conrad.

**Fortnightly Review.** Jan. 1924. Cecil Roberts, Byron in Venice.

**Edinburgh Review.** Jan. 1924. A. B. Walkley, The Novels of Jane Austen. — Stephen Gwynn, Maurice Hewlett.

**Journal of English and Germanic Philology.** XXII, 4. Oct. 1923. L. I. Bredvold, The Naturalism of Donne in relation to some Renaissance traditions. — A. Morton Turner, Wordsworth and Hartley Coleridge.

**Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.** XXXVIII, 4. Dec. 1923. W. L. Bullock, The Genesis of the English Sonnet Form. — H. Spencer, *Hamlet* under the Restoration. — F. Hubbard, The readings of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*. — E. H. Hespelt, Shelley and Spain. — S. T. Williams, Walter Savage Landor as a critic of literature. — G. R. Elliott, The Arnoldian lyric melancholy.

**Studies in Philology.** XX, 3. July 1923. K. Campbell, The relation of Poe to his times. — P. E. More, A note on Poe's method. — N. Foerster, Quantity and quality in Poe's aesthetic. — J. Erskine, Whitman's Prosody. — E. Holloway, Whitman as critic of America. — *Id.* XX, 4. Oct. 1923. A. H. Gilbert, The outside shell of Milton's world. — T. S. Graves, Some Chaucer allusions (1561-1700). — H. R. Patch and R. Menner, Bibliography of Middle English dialects.

**Modern Language Notes.** XXXIX, 2. Febr. 1924. Includes: A. S. Cook, *Beowulf*, 1422. — J. M. Beatty Jr., Doctor Johnson and 'Mur'. — *Id.* 3, March 1924. H. H. Clark, A study of melancholy in Edward Young, Part I. — F. B. Kaye, Mandeville on the origin of language. — F. E. Pierce, Blake and seventeenth century authors. — M. F. Tilley, Good drink makes good blood (*Much Ado*, I. 1. 250). — A. H. Krappe, A Byzantine source of Shakespeare's *Othello*. — H. M. Belden, *The Jew's Daughter* and the Myth of Zagreus.

**Modern Philology.** XXI, 2. Nov. 1923. E. Rickert, Political propaganda and satire in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. II. — H. R. Plomer, Edmund Spenser's handwriting. — F. S. Graves, On the reputation of John Heywood.

**Revue Anglo-Américaine.** I. 3. Févr. 1924. G. Lafourcade, I. Swinburne et Baudelaire. — II. Traduction en vers d' *Ave Atque Vale*. — J. Catel, Le roman d'amour de Walt Whitman. — R. Lamar, Du nouveau sur l'auteur d' *Hudibras*. — E. Guyot, A un tournant de l'histoire politique anglaise.

**Scandinavian Scientific Review.** Vol. II, 114–123. S. B. Liljegren, Milton's Philology in the light of recent research.

**Studier i Nordisk Filologi** utgivna genom Hugo Pipping. Vol. XIV, no. 3, pp. 1–46. Helsingfors 1923. C. W. von Sydow, Beowulf och Bjarke.

**Edda.** Christiania, 1923. R. E. Zachrisson, Stil och personlighet i Thomas Hardys diktnng. pp. 57–98.

**Moderna Språk.** Vol. XVII, April 1923. D. Elfstrand, On English Intonation (21–23). — H. Hagelin, Consonant substitutions in baby speech (40–48). — **Id.** Dec. 1923. H. Hagelin, Cons. subst. in baby speech (157–164). — H. Klinghardt, Allerhand über Tonfall als Unterrichtsgegenstand (164–182).

**Beiblatt zur Anglia.** XXXIV, 11 (Nov. 1923). Reviews, including Fr. Klæber, on *Beowulf*. Translated by C. K. Scott Moncrieff, and on *Beowulf*. A New Verse Translation for Fireside and Class Room, by W. E. Leonard. — Max Förster, on M. A. Bayfield, A Study of Shakespeare's Versification. — Also articles: H. Mutschmann, Milton's Selbstdarstellung in *L'Allegro* und *Il Penseroso*. — F. Holthausen, Zur englischen Wortkunde. VI. — **Id.** XXXIV, 12 (Dec. 1923). Reviews, including F. Holthausen, on *Beowulf* and the *Fight at Finnsburg*, ed. by Fr. Klæber. — S. B. Liljegren, on Jiriczek, Specimens of Tudor Translations from the Classics. — Karl Jost, on Ekwall, The Place-Names of Lancashire. — Joh. Ellinger, on E. Krusinga, A Handbook of Present-Day English. — Also an article: F. Holthausen, Zur englischen Laut- und Formengeschichte. — **Id.** XXXV, 1 (Jan. 1924). B. Fehr, on Jos. Wiham, Die Hamletsage, on Lilian Winstanley, *Hamlet* and the Scottish Succession, and *Macbeth*, *King Lear* and Contemporary History, on H. M. Jones, The King in *Hamlet*, on L. Morsbach, Der Weg zu Shakespeare und zum Hamletdrama, and on Charles I. Sisson, Le Gout Public et le Théâtre Elisabethain jusqu' à la mort de Shakespeare. — E. Ekwall, on Otto Ritter, Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte, on E. Rothstein, Die Wortstellung in der Peterborough Chronik, and on H. Albert, Mittelalterlicher englisch-französischer Jargon. — **Id.** XXXV, 2 (Febr. 1924). Reviews, including F. Holthausen, on J. H. Kern, De taalvormen van 't middelengelsche gedicht *Havelok*, on *Ludus Coventriae*, ed. by K. S. Block, and on H. Matter, Englische Gründungssagen von Geoffry of Monmouth bis zur Renaissance. — B. Fehr, on Charles F. G. Masterman, England after the War. — E. I. W. Brenner, on W. Picht, England nach dem Kriege. — Also an article: S. B. Liljegren, Die Gedichte Rupert Brookes.

**Literaturblatt f. Germ. u. Rom. Philologie.** XLIV, 9–12 (Sept.–Dec. 1923). Reviews, including Leo Spitzer, on Jespersen, Language, its nature, development and origin. — F. Holthausen, on Otto Ritter, Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte. — R. Ackermann, on C. Brown, *The Stonyhurst Pageants*. — L. Pfandl, on R. Grossmann, Spanien und das elisabethanische Drama. — A. Streuber, on Stefan Zweig, Drei Meister. Balzac, Dickens, Dostojewski.

**Germ. Rom. Monatsschrift.** XI, 11–12 (Nov.–Dec. 1923). Includes Hermann M. Flasdieck, Der sprachgeschichtliche Wert der mittellenglischen Überlieferung.

**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** XLV, 1–4 (Jan.–Febr. 1923). Reviews, including Brandl, on H. W. Garrod, Wordsworth. — Hans Hecht, on Brandl, Shakespeare.

**Anzeiger f. deutsches Altertum u. deutsche Lit.** XLIII, 1 (1924). Reviews, including Wolfgang Krause, on Horn, Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion. — Hermann M. Flasdieck, on O. Ritter, Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte.

**Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum u. deutsche Lit.** LXI, 1 (1924). Includes: Edward Schröder, Writan und scriban.

**Die Literatur.** 26. Jahrgang des **Lit. Echo**, 4 (Jan. 1924). Reviews, including R. F. Arnold, on Helene Richter, Shakespeare der Mensch.

**Die Neueren Sprachen.** XXXI, 4 (Oct.–Dec. 1923). Includes Max Müller, Die englische Gildenbewegung. — Reviews, including O. L. Jiriczek, on Chambers, *Beowulf*. — Karl Ehrke, on Baumgarten, Religiöses und kirchliches Leben in England, on Levy, Die englische Wirtschaft, and on Ehlers, Farbige Worte im England der Kriegszeit. — Fritz Karpf, on Joh. Hoops, Englische Sprachkunde.



## Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*,

considered as a work of literary art.

To analyse critically a work of art like *Philaster* or *Loue lies a Bleeding*, in which it is so much easier to see the artistic shortcomings than the literary merits, is a self-imposed task from which one might well shrink, remembering the sarcastic remark, made by Coleridge in his first Shakespeare-lecture, that 'reviewers are usually people who would have been poets, historians, biographers etc. if they could'. The dangers of such an analysis are, indeed, apparent. Our first duty will be, if we wish to remain fair to the authors, to bear in mind another remark, addressed by Coleridge to the young, but which no one can afford to neglect. In the sixth lecture he says: 'To the young I would remark, that it is always unwise to judge anything by its defects: the first attempt ought to be to discover its excellences'. Analysis, however, in our sense of the word was hardly in vogue in Coleridge's days. In his admirable 'Introduction to the Study of Literature', Hudson is not thinking of the critics of the early nineteenth century, when he says, 'Analysis must not be allowed to outrun its proper purpose and to become an end in itself; if we are right in considering how a great piece of literature has come to be what it is, it is still with the work as it is that we have mainly to do'.

Keeping all this in mind I propose to subject *Philaster* to a critical analysis. As soon as one begins to have more than a reading acquaintance with Beaumont and Fletcher's works, one cannot help wondering what it is that makes them look so pale and so unsatisfactory by the side not only of their great contemporary but even when compared with the work of a good many writers of secondary rank, what it is that has made it impossible for them to stand what Lafcadio Hearne calls 'the awful test of time'. The justification of this kind of critical analysis lies in this that it helps us to acquire the literary taste and discrimination which with certain restrictions enables us to distinguish the genuine and permanent from the spurious and ephemeral and consequently throws into shining relief the eternal beauty of the works of the masterminds of mankind.

What do we ask of a great writer? To this question there are of course as many answers as there are people able to put it. 'The makers of literature', says Arnold Bennett, 'are those who have seen and felt the miraculous interestingness of the universe'.<sup>1)</sup> Shaw, insisting with his usual vehemence that art is important on account of its 'solid usefulness', maintains that 'the great artist is he who by supplying works of a higher beauty and a higher interest than have yet been perceived, succeeds, after a brief struggle with its strangeness, in adding this fresh extension of sense to the heritage of the race'.<sup>2)</sup> 'It is not enough for [an artist] to be an artist; he must be a man', says F. De Santis. 'What does he express if his inner world is poor

---

<sup>1)</sup> Arnold Bennett, *Literary Taste*, p. 6.

<sup>2)</sup> Bernard Shaw. *The Sanity of Art*, p. 69.

or artificial or mechanical, if he has no belief there, if he has not felt it, if he has nothing to realize externally?'<sup>1)</sup> Hudson while emphasizing his opinion that works of art must be ethically sound, remarks that a great artist must be true to the great elemental facts and forces of life. The number of quotations might, of course, be augmented indefinitely. To me personally it often seems that a great artist should do one thing above all others: he should help us to leave for a time '(notre) dépouille à la terre'<sup>2)</sup> or in the words of Einstein, who owned that Dostoiewsky gave him greater pleasure than Gauss: the work of a great artist should produce a sense of elevation.<sup>3)</sup>

Now it is obvious that when we apply this high standard — and no other standard should ultimately be applied to a work of art — Beaumont and Fletcher do not come up to it. And yet they were undoubtedly men of extraordinary ability and even genius, especially Beaumont, if, as seems well-nigh inevitable, we may accept the conclusions of modern scholarship as to the share each had in what is attributed to them both. The question then naturally suggests itself what it was that prevented these men from producing the best that was in them. The answer, it seems to me, must be that they did not live in accordance with Polonius' advice: they were not true to themselves, they lacked the moral strength to resist the temptation of satisfying audiences whose literary tastes are of necessity crude, and what was worse they deliberately pandered to the prurient appetites of high and low.

Now playwrights who constantly keep their eye on the audience, will inevitably decline towards melodrama and Beaumont and Fletcher are no exception to the rule. In *Philaster* the conduct of the action is what we find in melodrama: the play is a tragi-comedy and tragedy is only averted at the very last moment, indeed the king has already sent for the 'headman'. Then, there is the noble outspoken hero, in serious trouble through no fault of his own; and the self-sacrificing maid of the well-known type that lives in popular story and ballad. Nor is the prison-scene forgotten 'which', as Gay was to gibe at a later period, 'the Ladies always reckon charmingly pathetick'. And thrilling situations there are galore. All the noble characters in turn offer to kill themselves (in *Philaster* himself it is a perfect mania) or beg to be killed — and the sword is not only drawn but has already pierced the skin when the worst is prevented. The mob-scene, too, is beloved of popular audiences. It is only made possible here by the somewhat improbable circumstance of the foreign prince Pharamond taking a quiet stroll through the town on the very morning on which his enemy, the darling of the people, is going to be executed. Lastly there is in many places that boisterous rhetoric to which Gayley justly applies the epithet 'vulgar', rhetoric quite unworthy of the authors of many beautiful bits of poetry and for which, one learns with relief, Fletcher may be mainly held responsible.

The mob-scene forms part of the comic-relief action. It is, I believe, not unfair to say that all the scenes belonging to this part of the action betray want of refinement. The humour generally partakes of the practical joke: a lover caught with his mistress, a ridiculous foreigner rudely handled by the mob. But worst of all is the moral depravity that is evident from some scenes of this subplot. And on this there can hardly be two opinions, for

<sup>1)</sup> Quoted in *The Adelphi* I, 7.

<sup>2)</sup> Lamartine: *L'isolement*.

<sup>3)</sup> *The Adelphi* I, 8.

whatever one may think personally of the naturalistic products of our own time — and it may be granted unconditionally that a genuine artist may feel drawn to an investigation of the lowest depths of depraved humanity and may discover a horrible kind of beauty there <sup>1)</sup> — no one can defend coarseness introduced for no better reason than to make the vulgar laugh or to satisfy the unchaste imagination of a corrupt theatre-going public.

Of course I do not mean to suggest that any playwright that wants to see his dramas acted can ignore his audience. Shakespeare certainly did not do that. Better than any one else he knew how to make a play effective and interesting even to those who could not really understand it. But what Shakespeare did not do is deliberately sacrificing truth, eternal truth that is, to stage-effect. <sup>2)</sup> That our authors stand guilty of this a close analysis of Philaster's character will, I hope, conclusively show.

In Philaster the authors intended to draw a manly man, one who boldly stands up for his rights; the men admire him, two good women love him, the people adore him. And, to leave nothing wanting in him, they have added just enough of the feminine without which a man is never quite lovable: he is as tender-hearted and gentle to his page as Shakespeare's Brutus. One quality, verging on a fault, is brought out clearly from the first: he is impulsive, opposition or injustice rouse him to violent outbursts of rage. But a fundamental mistake is made in the beginning. If we are to understand his behaviour to Arethusa later on, we must be deeply convinced of one grave flaw in his character: he is suspicious and capable of blind jealousy. Shakespeare never fails to show us all the important qualities of the principal personages in the opening scenes, not only, we may safely suppose, because he saw the technical necessity of this, but because from the beginning the creatures of his imagination were to him as real as human beings of flesh and blood. In our play we hear of Philaster's suspiciousness and jealousy only in the first scene of the third act, after Dion has told him that he caught Arethusa with her boy. After such a revelation we expect in different mortals and at different moments various ways of meeting the shock, from Othello's heart-rending: 'The pity of it, Iago, the pity of it,' to his mad bellowing like a wounded bull. The latter kind is aimed at here, it is more easily effective on the stage. But Philaster's outburst is hollow rhetoric all the same; there is too much about thunder and devils in it to move us really. It is not Philaster speaking here, but it is Philaster who is made to say certain words that the situation seems to require and the audience will applaud.

Now the fact that Philaster's jealousy has been insufficiently brought home to us, has grave consequences: it makes three subsequent scenes seem utterly improbable. The first is where Bellario, whose protestations of innocence would convince a fiend, is sent away. The only impression Philaster makes here is one of stupidity. Again how different from Othello. <sup>3)</sup> Here we feel at every step how under the guidance of his evil genius he must blindly run to meet his fate. Quite in accordance with fact the authors make Philaster interpret Bellario's innocent words the wrong way, but is there

<sup>1)</sup> 'Everything is beautiful that has character', Rodin said to Paul Gsell once. (See Paul Gsell, Auguste Rodin, *Die Kunst*, p. 32.)

<sup>2)</sup> I am aware of the fact that some blemishes in Shakespeare must be ascribed to the same cause, but this hardly detracts from the truth of this statement.

<sup>3)</sup> It might be objected that the characters of a comedy ought not to be compared with those of a tragedy. But as our comedy is mainly tragic and consequently serious in tone, I think this objection need not be seriously considered.



anything in Philaster's character that made this inevitable? It is a minor blemish, and on the stage it will certainly pass unnoticed, that Bellario is expressly made to say:

what I came to know  
As servant to her, I would not reveale,  
To make my life last ages. (III, 1, 226 ff. <sup>1</sup>)

Desdemona continually says the most unfortunate things, but although, as Mr. Kooistra pointed out in one of the previous numbers of this periodical, this is one of the weak spots in *Othello*, we generally feel that, utterly ignorant as she is of what is in *Othello's* mind, and placed as she is, she cannot help saying them.

The second scene that is made to seem improbable is that where Arethusa and Philaster part. In one respect, however, the authors have done much to make this scene more convincing. Before Philaster comes to Arethusa, the king has ordered her to send the boy away. To Philaster this must seem additional proof, but for all that the frank way in which she talks of it all would have disarmed a man as Philaster is represented to be in the first two acts. Thus we again come to the conclusion that what dominated in the minds of the poets was the creation of a pathetic situation: two lovers parting.

In the forest (there is always a forest handy in most of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays) Philaster for a moment comes to himself. Here we see again what Beaumont can be at his best (and let us remember that he was still a young man when he died). Philaster tries seriously to master his passion, but the misery of it all breaks out suddenly in words which come straight from the heart of a suffering human being:

Tempt me not, you gods! good gods,  
Tempt not a fraile man! (IV, 3, 23.)

Unfortunately all this is only a preparation for the most thrilling scene of the play, a scene which it would require the highest art both of writer and actor to make dramatically probable, but which here, chiefly owing to the fundamental omission referred to above, becomes quite ridiculous. I mean the scene where Philaster first asks Bellario and Arethusa to kill him and then offers to kill Arethusa. This passage by itself would almost be sufficient to show that these authors were not bent on probing life. But even from their own point of view they have missed an opportunity here, for the scene would have been infinitely more pathetic and consequently more effective, if Arethusa like Desdemona had clung to life. Beaumont and Fletcher have been content with the cheaper trick: Arethusa joyfully welcomes death from Philaster's hands:

If fortune <sup>2</sup>) be so good, to let me fall  
Upon thy hand, I shall have peace in death. (IV, 3, 66.)

I now come to what seems to me the worst blot in the play. After Philaster has been prevented by the country-fellow from killing Arethusa, he flies and to draw away suspicion from himself he wounds Bellario, whom the authors immediately after the sensational events just discussed have kindly allowed to fall asleep. Philaster, it is true, tries to deprecate our aversion, but the attempt is somewhat inept:

<sup>1</sup>) I quote from Thorndike's edition in the *Belles Lettres Series*, which is based on the second quarto. I have only mentioned the deviations of the second folio, of which the Cambridge edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's works is a reprint, where it seemed of some importance for my present purpose.

<sup>2</sup>) The second folio has 'my fortunes'.

Sword, print my wounds  
 Upon this sleeping boy! I ha none, I thinke  
 Are mortal, nor would I lay greater on thee. (IV, 4, 23 ff.)

Now why do the authors deliberately represent Philaster as being capable of such a dastardly trick? When Shakespeare makes Hamlet do or say ignoble things, we suffer just as much as when we see a friend at moments at which he is not himself, but also feel that Shakespeare makes Hamlet commit crimes (there is hardly another word for it), because such characters at such moments must act in that way, that consequently Shakespeare was brave enough to face the truth even about what may have been the most beloved child of his imagination. Of all this there is nothing in Philaster. We feel revolted at the deed, Philaster himself is quite indifferent to us. The truth is that the authors sacrificed his character to stage-effect. What they want to bring out here is Bellario's self-sacrifice raised to the highest melodramatic pitch. The strange thing is that Beaumont and Fletcher themselves seem to have been quite unconscious of the effect this scene must have produced, for immediately after, when the king's emissaries arrest Bellario, Philaster is loudly virtuous again:

Turne back, you ravishers of innocence!  
 Know ye the price of that you beare away  
 So rudely? (IV, 4, 84.)

This from the mouth of the man who has just ignominiously tried to direct suspicion to the innocent boy for whom he now stands up! Again what the authors have their eye on is the fine scene which ensues: the rivalry in nobleness between Philaster and Bellario. And so little did they feel that Philaster's reputation had been irretrievably hurt that in the last scene he is again placed in circumstances that are eminently fit to make him seem ridiculous. When the king orders Bellario to be tortured, Philaster, who has unwisely given his consent before he knew what the king would ask of him, offers to kill himself in expiation of his folly. As if this was not bad enough, we see him once more in a very unfavourable light. After all that has happened, Dion's words 'Alls discovered' are enough to make him suspect Arethusa's truth again. The scene is very characteristic of Beaumont:

*Dion.* Alls discovered.  
*Phi.* Why then hold you me?  
 All is discovered! Pray you, let me go.  
*He offers to stab himselfe.*  
*King.* Stay him.  
*Are.* What is discovered?  
*Dion.* Why, my shame.  
 It is a woman: let her speak the rest.  
*Phi.* How? <sup>1)</sup> that againe!  
*Dion.* It is a woman.  
*Phi.* Blest be you powers that favour innocence!  
*King.* Lay hold upon the lady. (*Megra is seized*<sup>2)</sup>).  
*Phi.* It is a woman, sir! — Harke, gentlemen,  
 It is a woman! — Arethusa, take  
 My soule into thy brest, that would be gone  
 With joy.

(V, 5, 122)

A complete melodrama in about a dozen lines! And again the authors are unconscious of what they have made of their hero, for what we want

<sup>1)</sup> *F<sub>1</sub>*: how!  
<sup>2)</sup> Not in *F<sub>1</sub>*.

after this are a few words of humble shame, what we get is some words of his to Arethusa whom he evidently still thinks a happy woman with such a man as he is to love her, and worst of all he of all men preaches to Bellario and lays the blame on her:

But, Bellario,  
 (For I must call thee still so,) tell me why  
 Thou didst conceale thy sex. It was a fault,  
 A fault, Bellario, though thy other deeds  
 Of truth outwaigh'd it. All these jealousies  
 Had flown to nothing, if thou hadst discovered  
 What now we know. (V, 5, 144.)

From what has been said, we may, I believe, conclude that the character of Philaster is artistically a failure. Obviously the authors were more interested in the portrayal of women, although here too they cannot be said to be seekers after truth in the first place. Euphrasia-Bellario, far and away their most poetical creation, is of course not real and not meant to be so. She is the personification of self-sacrificing love and the authors have not spoilt their own creation. If it is somewhat difficult for us quite to believe for a time in the existence of Euphrasia, as we believe in that of Miranda or Viola, it is because the language of the authors, however much its urbanity and ease may be praised, is on the whole not able to transport us into regions where realities do not matter or rather where the boundary-line between reality and romance has disappeared. However, if Beaumont had written the play alone and could have forgotten the stage, what a sublime poem he would have written. Personally I must confess that but for some three or four passages, too long to quote, which Beaumont has devoted to Bellario, the play would hardly be worth reading. I mean of course such passages as that where Philaster describes how he first found the boy (I, 2, 113 ff.) or that where Euphrasia reveals the truth (V, 5, 150).

Arethusa's character, too, is well-sustained. It must, however, be pointed out that her behaviour in the scene where she sends away Bellario (IV, 2, 142) is just as unintelligible to us as Philaster's. She, too, suddenly turns out to be unreasonably suspicious. And in her, just as, though not so obviously, in Bellario, the authors generally fail to make us believe in the reality of their sorrows. I wonder if any lines could be quoted from the play that go so directly to the heart of the matter as those which Chaucer puts into Grisilde's mouth:

O gode god! how gentil and how kinde  
 Ye semed by your speche and your visage  
 The day that maked was our mariage!

*The Clerkes Tale*, II. 853 ff.

These are words that come from a woman who is suffering atrociously and can only think of the pain in her heart. Let us compare with them Bellario's words after Philaster has sent him away.

I will flie as farre  
 As there is morning, ere I give distaste  
 To that most honor'd mind. But through these teares  
 Shed at my hopelesse parting, I can see  
 A world of treason practisde upon you,  
 And her, and me. Farwell for ever more!  
 If you shall heare that sorrow strucke me dead,  
 And after finde me loyall, let there be  
 A teare shed from you in my memory,  
 And I shall rest at peace. (III, 1, 286 ff.)



And Arethusa's complaint after Philaster's departure is in the same strain :

Be mercifull, ye gods, and strike me dead!  
What way have I deserv'd this? (III, 2, 128.)

Both women seem to appeal to us for pity and allude to their own death as a means to excite it.

How hopelessly these two poets were led astray is brought out in one scene which it is hard to forgive them. In the wood even Bellario falls a victim to their desire of producing pathetic or sensational scenes: he is made to beg of Philaster for no better reason than to let the audience once more indulge in pity for the pretty page, who is for the third time rudely sent away. Still the very fact that we resent the way in which Bellario is treated by the authors, shows to what a remarkable degree they have succeeded in giving life to their creation.

An analysis of the minor characters of the play would lead to similar results, but seems uncalled for. I hope to have shown, without having been too much on the look-out for what seems aesthetically faulty, what it was that caused Beaumont and Fletcher to produce a play that was in many respects far below the best that at least Beaumont could have done, if he had tried to remain 'true to the elemental facts and forces of life'. Those who have read one or more of the plays written by Fletcher alone, will doubt if the same can be claimed for him.

The Hague, March 1924.

J. H. SCHUTT.

## Contributions to English Syntax.

### XIII. Aspect.

Since Streitberg wrote his article on aspects in Germanic (Paul und Braune's Beiträge 15, pp. 70-177) it has become more and more evident that a systematic grammar of modern Germanic languages cannot ignore aspect, even though it does not form a regular grammatical category in any of the languages of this group.

In an earlier volume of this periodical I have attempted to treat the subject in a form that seemed suitable to those who begin the study of English grammar. A revision of this article is found in the last edition of my Handbook. The subject, however, continued to be considered 'difficult', and it has seemed useful, therefore, to consider the subject once more, and to add illustrations from well-known languages. Such illustrations may seem less 'learned' than examples from Greek or Sanskrit, or even more out-of-the-way languages, but they are probably more useful, and may help to show that a thorough understanding of the structure of a language is often promoted by comparison rather than what is specially called historical grammar. In the following pages I offer the reader a treatment of aspect in present-day English as I propose to insert in the next edition of my *Accidence and Syntax*.

161. Aspect is the translation of a term used in Slavonic grammar to denote the character of a verbal form in so far as it expresses whether the action is looked upon in its entirety, or with special reference to some part (chiefly the beginning or the end).

162. The Germanic languages usually have no form to express differences of aspect. But this does not prevent speakers of these languages from being frequently conscious of such differences.<sup>1)</sup> And occasionally there are forms that serve, partly or exclusively, to express differences of aspect.

163. In imitation of Slavonic grammar we chiefly distinguish an *imperfective* and a *perfective* aspect.

The difference between imperfective and perfective is soonest understood when the two aspects are contrasted. An imperfective aspect is generally expressed by *to sit*, a perfective by *to sit down*: *he sat in a corner of the room*; *he sat down in a corner of the room*.

The imperfective aspect necessarily implies duration; hence it is often called the *durative* aspect. The perfective aspect often considers the action with regard to the moment of its completion, hence it is also called the *momentaneous* aspect.

164. Perfectivity is often expressed in English by adding an adverb: *to sit down*, *to sit up* (in bed), *to sink down*, *to burn down*, *to lie down*, *to stand up*, *to pull up*, *to drive away*. These groups are separable compounds.

Composition is also a frequent means of making a verb perfective in Dutch; compare the simple verb and its compound in the following cases: *uitlezen*, *opeten*, *inslikken*, *uitspuwen*, *verhoren*, *inschrijven*, etc.

165. A translation of the Dutch words will show that English sometimes uses different words, in other cases uses one verb for both aspects.

Thus *opeten* would often be rendered by *to finish*, *eten* by *to eat*; *inschrijven* by *to enter*; *schrijven* by *to write*; *uitlezen* by *to finish*, *lezen* by *to read*. On the other hand both *slikken* and *inslikken* are *to swallow*: *It hurts me to swallow (slikken)* and *Baby will swallow the ball if you don't take it away (inslikken)*.

166. Composition by means of an adverb or prefix to express aspect is found in several Indogermanic languages. Students of Old Germanic may be reminded of the Gothic prefix *ga-* (Dutch *ge*). In Modern French the prefix *re* (or *r*, before vowels) is often used, especially in colloquial French, to express the perfective aspect.<sup>2)</sup> Thus *rabattre*, *rabaisser*, *rattraper*, *réunir* chiefly differ from the simple verbs *abattre*, *abaisser*, *attraper*, *unir* by the aspect they express. The original meaning of *re-* 'again' is often completely lost, so that *rentrez donc* may be said although the person addressed has never entered the house.

167. Sometimes two completely different verbs may be looked upon as a pair, one expressing the imperfective, the other the perfective aspect.

Imperfective	Perfective
to live	to settle
to strike	to hit
to say	to tell
to hold <sup>3)</sup>	to seize

Another pair is *to ascend* (imperf.) and *to mount* (perfective). This difference is clear when we compare *to ascend a hill*, and *to mount a hill*. Hence also, though we can say *to mount a horse*, it would be absurd to say *to ascend a horse*.

<sup>1)</sup> It would be a mistake, however, to force all verbs into some class with regard to aspect. Many may be said to be indifferent in this respect, e.g. *to give*, *lend*, *explain*, *revenge*, *punish*, *greet*, *confess*, *justify*, etc.

<sup>2)</sup> Vendryes, *Le Langage*, p. 130 f.

<sup>3)</sup> But *to hold up*, *to hold in* (the reins), are perfective, according to 164.

168. It may also help the student to become familiar with the difference of aspect, if some examples are added of the same verb expressing the two aspects in different contexts.

1. (Imperf.) We call a man blind when he cannot see.  
(Perf.) I see what you mean.
2. (Imperf.) We call a man deaf when he cannot hear.  
(Perf.) I did not hear what you said.
3. I have *thought*<sup>1)</sup> of your proposal, but I don't *think*<sup>2)</sup> it is a practicable plan.
4. (Imperf.) He knows English very well.  
(Perf.) I wonder how he should have known us for Americans. Oxf. Dict.
5. (Imperf.) Go and learn your lessons now.  
(Perf.) All that he knew about their treachery he had learned at second hand. Macaulay (Oxf. Dict.).

169. The distinction of an imperfective and a perfective aspect is not exhaustive. Thus the difference between *to read a book* and *to peruse a book* is hardly correctly stated by calling *read* imperfective, *peruse* perfective. The latter might perhaps be called *terminative*, because it expresses the action as occupying an amount of time but with special reference to its end. Such a distinction would only be useful, however, if there were many verbs showing the same difference; it would be necessary if there were grammatical means of expressing it. But neither of these cases is found in English.

170. It may be useful, however, to distinguish an *iterative* aspect, which means regular repetition of the same action.

The iterative aspect is often expressed by the verb without any outward change. It may be indicated by an accompanying adverb adjunct.

After dinner sit a while, after supper walk a mile.

School begins at 8.30 A.M. except on Wednesdays and Saturdays.

He goes to Germany once a year.

He always declared that it was impossible for him to interfere.

When I have asked a singer, as I have constantly had to do, whether he sang a particular song, I have often received the reply, etc.

Sharp, English Folk-Song, p. 17.

171. The distinction of an iterative aspect enables us to explain the difference between *to have* and *to have got*. It makes no difference to the meaning expressed whether we say *He has a lot of money* or *He has got a lot of money*. And yet, instead of *Every year he has a month's holiday* it would be impossible to say: *he has got*. The reason is that the perfect present is durative, not iterative.

172. The iterative aspect may be distinguished from the *frequentative* aspect. Thus, frequent repetition is expressed by repetition of a word (often with vowel-variation) as in *fiddle-faddle*, etc. The distinction of these two aspects is also useful in discussing the difference between *would* and *used*.

173. Sometimes a verb is used to express the beginning of the action, the *inchoative* aspect. Such verbal expressions are *to catch sight of*, *to take possession of*, *to take one's stand*. Very often, however, it is the context only that shows us that the inchoative aspect is meant, as in the following sentences with *to know* and *to stand*.

When I first knew him, during my engagement to my husband, he had just practically — though not formally — given up his orders. Mrs. H. Ward, Harper's, May 1918.

Five minutes went by, and then a man in uniform, like a 'bus conductor, came out of nowhere, and stood in front of him.

Temple Thurston, Thirteen I p. 29.

<sup>1)</sup> Imperfective.

<sup>2)</sup> Perfective.



We might in the same way distinguish *to recollect* as inchoative from *to remember* as durative. It will be seen that the inchoative is closely related to the perfective aspect: the cause is that both draw special attention to one point of the time of the action.

174. Up to the present we have only discussed the aspects as far as they can be deduced from the meanings of the verbs. Such differences concern the lexicographer rather than the grammarian<sup>1)</sup>. There is also a temptation of making such distinctions a game of ingenuity without much regard to grammatical needs. This temptation is the greater because English, like other modern Indogermanic languages, has very few grammatical forms to express distinctions of aspect. Indeed, apart from the English progressive, we cannot say that aspect is a regular grammatical category in any of the modern languages of Europe, with the exception of the Slavonic group. For this reason it seems useful to point out the traces of a grammatical expression of differences of aspect in the languages that may be supposed to be more or less familiar to our readers.

175. It is well-known that the perfect tense of some verbs takes *to have* or *to be* according to the aspect that must be expressed. The difference is not very marked, however, and it is generally possible to use either construction without producing what would be decidedly wrong English. In this respect it differs from the similar difference in the perfect of verbs of movement in Dutch. These verbs *must* take *hebben* in their imperfective aspect, as in *wij hebben een paar uur gewandeld* (we have walked for a couple of hours). And they *must* take *zijn* in their perfective aspect, as in *wij zijn weer naar huis gewandeld* (we have walked home again). Just as in English the difference of aspect is not formally expressed in any other tense<sup>2)</sup>.

176. Dutch also has a means of expressing the durative aspects: the copula *zijn* (*to be*) with *aan* and the infinitive used as a noun with the neuter article: *Hij is aan het verven*, which is perfectly equivalent to *He is painting*.

French uses a similar construction to ours: *Je suis à lire, je suis en train de lire*.<sup>3)</sup>

177. French also has<sup>4)</sup> a means of expressing the perfective or momentaneous aspect when the verb refers to the past: the *passé défini*. This is similar to the Greek aorist, but it should be remembered that the Greek aorist does not necessarily express past time,<sup>5)</sup> the difference between the infinitive *βάλεῖν* of the aorist expressing 'to hit', and the present infinitive *βάλλειν* 'to throw', e.g., being naturally independent of time.

178. The frequentative aspect is brought out in English by the suffixes *-le*, *-re*, as in *crackle*, *prattle*, *sparkle*, *clamber*, *glitter*, *slumber*. But these verbs are not formed with a living suffix, so that we ought rather to say that the aspect is expressed by special verbs.

<sup>1)</sup> For a very full treatment of this question, see Poutsma, *Characters of the English Verb*, 1921.

<sup>2)</sup> It may not be superfluous to point out that the difference of aspect is independent of distinctions of time.

<sup>3)</sup> Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, p. 187.

<sup>4)</sup> Or *had*, for it is really lost in spoken French.

<sup>5)</sup> Brugmann—Thumb, *Griechische Grammatik*, §§ 554 ff.

It may also be pointed out that the frequentative aspect expressed by these formations is not identical with that of the verbs referred to. In *crackle*, *prattle*, etc. it is not the repetition of an action that is expressed, but an action that is looked upon as being itself an iteration of simpler actions. See also below, on *to keep* and other auxiliaries of aspect.

179. We have a living suffix denoting the inchoative aspect in *to redden*, *to sicken*. But this suffix is also used in other functions, so that the inchoative function is clear from the context only, or from the meaning of the verb, not from its form.

180. We sometimes find verbs with no other function than that of indicating the aspect of the following non-finite verb: such verbs may be called *auxiliaries of aspect*.

This is very clear in the cases of *will* when used to express repetition, so that it is treated as a form-word in the sections on *Auxiliaries*. In Dutch *liggen*, *staan*, and *zitten*, are used to express the durative aspect.<sup>1)</sup>

181. Other verbs are used occasionally to express differences of aspect. Among these we may mention *to come*, which frequently occurs as a means of expressing what may be called the *resultative* aspect.

The reproach of being a nation of mere imitators has been so frequently directed against the Japanese that it has come to be regarded as a truth specially applicable in their case.

The undisturbed stability of the motor-car market here can be explained only in one way, and that is that the motor-car is more and more coming to be realized as a commercial necessity. Times W. 1412, 17.

"This is a strange note," said Mr. Utterson; and then sharply: "How do you come to have it open?" Stevenson, Dr. Jekyll, ed. Schutt p. 73.

182. Similarly *to fall* is sometimes used to express the inchoative aspect. *To keep* with a verbal form in *-ing* is used as an auxiliary of the iterative aspect.

One night during this last illness that had brought him home he fell thinking of Zimbabwe and the lost cities of Africa. Wells, Joan and Peter ch. 9 § 3.

He kept changing his plans. Tout, History of England.

183. We might also look upon *to continue*, *to begin*, *to cease*, *to stop*, *to finish*, as auxiliaries of aspect.

No one is more loud or insistent than he who has just ceased to be labelled new. Waugh, Loom of Youth p. 26.

We never stop changing, yet we never change altogether.

Times Lit. 25, 5, 22.

But the historians will stop talking of Chaucer as a solitary lighthouse in a dark sea, and tiresomely recounting the names of Lydgate and Hoccleve as those of two dullards who happen to be remembered because there is nothing better to remember. J. C. Squire in Observer, Oct. 30, 1921.

As I finished speaking to Bony, he looked over to the grief-worn figure... de Morgan, Vance, ch. 41 p. 416.

Similarly *to be apt* might be said to express the frequentative aspect.

Separation . . . is apt to idealise the removed object.

Hardy, Far from the Madding Crowd, ch. 5.

E. KRUISINGA.

<sup>1)</sup> See my *Grammar of Modern Dutch*, § 163.

## Notes and News.

**English Studies in Sweden.** In the curriculum of the old Swedish grammar-school (gymnasium) there was no room for modern foreign languages. Yet there is no doubt that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries knowledge of foreign languages was widespread in Sweden. French was, of course, generally spoken or at least read among the upper classes. Many people would know German: it should be remembered that down to the beginning of the nineteenth century Sweden had dependencies in Germany. Knowledge of English, on the other hand, was probably a somewhat rare accomplishment. There are signs, however, that as early as the eighteenth century there was in Sweden some interest in English. A large and valuable English-Swedish dictionary was published in 1734 by Bishop Serenius, who for more than ten years had been chaplain to the Swedish legation in London. The long list of subscribers prefaced to the book indicates that there must have been a demand for such a work. A Swedish-English dictionary by the same author was published in 1741. There are further English grammars for Swedes that point in the same direction. The earliest of these dates from about 1730, and several others appeared in the course of the eighteenth century.

Modern languages began to be taught in the universities as early as the seventeenth century. For obvious reasons French and German predominated over English. There were no chairs for modern languages. The instruction was given by "language masters". It was no doubt purely practical and presumably of a very elementary kind. An English master was appointed at Uppsala in 1736. In Lund Iivar Kraak, by birth a Dane, taught French, Spanish and English from 1748 till 1781.

The education act of 1820 introduced modern foreign languages into the Government schools, but very little time was given to them. Only French and German formed part of the regular curriculum, and only two hours weekly in each of the two highest forms were allotted to both languages together. English was to be a voluntary subject, and it may be doubted if instruction in it was actually arranged in many schools. That the importance of foreign languages was beginning to be more fully realized, however, is proved by the fact that in the new school (Nya Elementarskolan), that was founded in Stockholm in 1827 and that was to be an experimental school where new pedagogic principles were to be tested, the study of modern languages began before that of Latin and that a good deal more time was allotted to them than in ordinary schools. In the school act of 1856 the importance of modern languages was fully recognized; at the same time Latin ceased to be a compulsory subject. French and German became regular subjects for all pupils of Government schools, and each language had considerable time allotted to it. French was looked upon as the more important of the two. English was taught only to those who did not take Latin, being voluntary for the others. Further changes were introduced in 1859, chiefly relating to the relative positions of French and German. German became the modern foreign language first taught. The number of weekly hours allotted to each language was somewhat reduced. More important changes took place in 1865. It now became possible to study Latin without Greek, and English took the place of Greek, being taught in the last four forms. Those who took Latin and Greek had voluntary English, but only one hour a week in the two highest forms. This system remained in force till 1905. The absence of English as a compulsory subject for those who took Latin and Greek



was a weak point in this system, for from this group the Arts and Theological faculties of the universities were chiefly or to a great extent recruited. It was not until 1905, however, that a change was made. German kept its place as the first and most important language. French was relegated to a less prominent place, and English became a regular subject for all pupils, ranking far above French as regards the time and importance devoted to it. This system is still in force. By the next reform, which is now being contemplated, the relative importance of English will probably be still more accentuated.

With the school reforms came a demand for trained teachers of languages, and it became necessary for the universities to provide the necessary training. Already before the school reforms, as a matter of fact, the importance of foreign languages and literatures had begun to be recognized at the universities, but at first the literatures attracted the chief interest. At Uppsala a chair for æsthetics (literature), to which also modern languages belonged, was founded in 1785. Soon afterwards the status and qualifications of the language masters were raised. Their title was changed into that of "adjunkt" (something like assistant professor), and they began to be looked upon as members of the teaching staff proper. In 1858 was founded at Uppsala a professorship of modern foreign languages. One group of languages was to be represented by the professor, the other falling to the lot of the "adjunkt". The teaching of modern languages was thus comparatively well provided for. At Lund university the development was slightly different. A chair of modern languages was founded by private endowment as early as 1813 (the Norberg professorship). The first holder of this professorship, however, a relative of the donor, did not possess any qualifications as a scholar, having acquired a practical familiarity with the languages in his earlier career as a sea-captain. He was not looked upon as an equal of the other professors and was not admitted as a member of the Senate. On his death, in 1835, the professorship was changed into a chair of æsthetics. This chair was held for 18 years by Carl August Hagberg, whose masterly translation of Shakespeare's dramas was looked upon as a classical work. In 1858 the Norberg professorship was restored to its original purpose and made into a professorship of modern languages. The further history of the study of modern languages is the same for both universities.

In 1886 a new professorship of modern languages was founded at each university, and the post of "adjunkt" was abolished. There was to be one chair of Germanic and one of Romance philology. It was soon seen, however, that two such subjects as German and English were too much for one man to teach, and Germanic languages, with the high standard required, were a very stiff subject for students to take. At last in 1903 the professorship of Germanic languages was split up into two, one of English and one of German. It should be added that when the University College of Gothenburg was founded (in 1888), chairs of Germanic languages and Romance languages were provided for. A special chair of English was founded in 1904, thanks to an endowment by Andrew Carnegie (the Andrew Carnegie professorship of English language and literature).

For some time after foreign languages had been introduced as real subjects taught at the universities the Romance languages dominated over the Germanic, the chief reason being no doubt the fact that the first professors of modern languages took greater interest in the former group of languages. Romance philology, consequently, began earlier to be made the subject of scientific study than Germanic. It was not until the Germanic languages had got their own representatives that the scientific study of them

began to make real headway. The greatest credit in this respect is due to professor Axel Erdmann, who was the first professor of Germanic languages at Uppsala. But also at Lund the study of Germanic languages took a great stride forward with the foundation of the chair of Germanic languages.

A further important change took place in the eighteen-eighties. It was soon seen that to make the teaching of modern languages really efficient it was necessary to give students opportunities of acquiring a firsthand knowledge of the languages. For this reason, from 1888 onwards, native University lecturers of English, French and German have been regularly appointed. The maximum time for a Lecturer is six years, a period that has only exceptionally been exceeded.

The study of modern languages is carried on in the Swedish universities on the same lines as at the Continental universities. The instruction is given, besides by the professors and by the Lecturers, by Docents, whose number varies. Seminars for Romance and Germanic languages, later for English and German, have been instituted. The seminars have libraries of their own, even if on a somewhat small scale. The University libraries, thanks to the munificence of the authorities, are well provided for economically and may be said to very well equipped for their purposes.

At present there is a good deal of interest in the study of English in our universities. The number of students preparing for exams in English at Uppsala exceeds a hundred, and at Lund the number is something like sixty or seventy. As an illustration of the interest taken in English it may be mentioned that in the last twenty years 22 doctor's dissertations in English have been published at Lund university, the number at Uppsala having been, I believe, about the same, or only slightly less. It need hardly be mentioned that the standard of the dissertations is on the whole high and that many of them are really important contributions. It should be added that a doctorate in a Swedish university does not exactly correspond to the German degree. To get the doctorate the candidate has first to pass a lower examination, which takes about three years (often more) and which at the same time qualifies for posts in Government schools. Then follows the higher examination, the degree of Licentiate of Philosophy, which takes about the same time, and for which a dissertation is required. After that the dissertation is published, generally after having been totally rewritten, and publicly discussed. The minimum number of subjects in the lower exam is now three; it may be added that in English knowledge of modern English (from Shakespeare onward) only is required. The higher exam embraces one subject only. A few years ago the number of subjects in the lower exam was five, in the higher two. When one of these was Germanic philology the exam was a really stiff one.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

---

**English Association in Holland.** The sixth annual meeting was held at Utrecht on June 15. The Executive Committee was re-elected, viz. Prof. Dr. J. H. Kern, Chairman, R. W. Zandvoort, Hon Secretary, Miss A. G. Kuipers, Ass. Secretary, and W. J. Smies, Hon. Treasurer.

The Association has a membership of about fourteen hundred, distributed over eleven local branches. A twelfth branch is in course of formation.

On October 19, the English Association will have terminated its first lustrum.

---

**Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen.** The annual meeting was held at Utrecht on June 10. Papers were read by Dr. Jan de Vries on *Het Onderzoek van Volksoverleveringen*, and by J. H. Schutt on *Moulton's Analysis of the Merchant of Venice*. The latter will shortly be published in English Studies.

In the English section a discussion took place on the desirability of testing the pronunciation of English at the final examinations of Gymnasias. The matter was referred to the General Committee.

**B-Examination 1923.** We give the following extract from the report of the Committee of Examiners (Staatscourant 2 and 3 May 1924, no. 86, Bijvoegsel):

De commissie vindt aanleiding tot het maken van de volgende opmerkingen.

Het kwam haar wenschelijk voor eenige wijziging te brengen in het mondeling gedeelte van het taalkundig examen. Terwijl het onderzoek naar de vaardigheid en uitspraak van de kandidaten en hun kennis van het taaleigen werd ingesteld op dezelfde wijze als in vorige jaren, werd het historische gedeelte in tweeën gesplitst: aan den eenen kant oud-Engelsch en geschiedenis van de Engelsche klank- en vormleer, aan den anderen nieuw-Engelsche syntaxis, beschouwd op historische wijze, d. w. z. in verband met oudere toestanden. Deze regeling heeft zeer voldaan en mag aan toekomstige commissies worden aanbevolen.

Bij het letterkundige examen is ook dit jaar weder gebleken dat sommige kandidaten, bij het kiezen van een speciaal letterkundig onderwerp, zich niet bewust zijn van de moeilijkheden aan een goede keus verbonden. Zoo kunnen b.v. schrijvers, die nog geenszins geacht kunnen worden aan het eind van hun loopbaan te zijn gekomen, wel van een belletristisch standpunt worden beschouwd, bezwaarlijk echter van een literair-historisch; — schrijvers als *Galsworthy* en *Wells* kunnen dus niet als eenig speciaal onderwerp in aanmerking komen. Schrijvers als *Coleridge* en *Goldsmith* behooren in hun tijd te worden gezien. Bij het kiezen van *Coleridge* kan men niet volstaan met zich tot zijn dichtwerk te beperken; de behandeling van *Goldsmith* vereischt bekendheid met zijn kring, en met tijdgenooten als *Burke* en *Johnson*.

Al te vaak nog kwamen in de ingezonden lijsten van gelezen en bestudeerde werken slordigheden en schrijffouten voor, of bleken die opgaven, bij het mondeling onderzoek, onnauwkeurig te zijn samengesteld. Soms vertoonden zij onjuistheden in de chronologische volgorde, of gapingen, die bij voorbeeld zouden doen veronderstellen, dat er tusschen *Shakespeare* en *Dryden* weinig anders geschreven was dan *l'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso* en *Paradise Lost*. En wat moet men denken van het opnoemen van gedichtjes als: *We are Seven* en *Alice Tell*, het eerste onder „gelezen”, het tweede onder „bestudeerd” gerangschikt!

Verschillende kandidaten toonden, door hun onbekendheid met *Bacon's* en *Bunyan's* werk, niet te weten, hoe het proza zich heeft ontwikkeld in de 17de eeuw en dat bijv. het moderne Engelsche proza by *Dryden* begint. Wat de stijlleer betreft, behoort de bestudeering niet beperkt te worden tot de kennis der metrische vormen: het onderwerp omvat ook een goed begrip van termen als allegorie, epigram, enz.



Enkele kandidaten hadden belangrijke gedeelten der oudere letterkunde verwaarloosd. De commissie meent er nog eens nadrukkelijk op te moeten wijzen, dat de Engelsche letterkunde vóór *Chaucer* begint. Ook raadt zij toekomstigen kandidaten aan goede vertalingen van klassieken als *Seneca* en *Plautus* te lezen, die een grooten invloed op de Engelsche literatuur hebben geoefend.

### Subjects set for essays:<sup>1)</sup>

1. Discuss Chaucer as a translator, imitator and inventor.
2. Discuss the Chaucerian characteristics, as revealed in *The Nonne Preestes Tale*.
3. Discuss the religious sonnet.
4. *The Sonnets from the Portuguese*.
5. The villain in Shakespeare.
6. History and fiction in *Richard III*.
7. Poetical justice in *King Lear*.
8. Milton's fitness by character and training for writing *Paradise Lost*.
9. Discuss the poetry of Milton's Horton period.
10. Discuss the term "picaresque novel" and illustrate your statements from English literature.
11. Discuss Nash's *Unfortunate Traveller*.
12. Sentiment and realism in Fielding.
13. Discuss the characteristic qualities of *Jonathan Wild the Great*.
14. Goldsmith's versatility.
15. Originality and imitation in *The Vicar of Wakefield*.
16. Revolutionism and reaction in Coleridge.
17. Discuss the supernatural in *The Ancient Mariner* and *Christabel*.
18. Scotch character in Scott's novels.
19. Discuss *The Monastery* and *The Abbot*.
20. Jane Austen's ideal of womanhood.
21. *Northanger Abbey* as a satire.
22. Shelley the poet's relation to contemporary poets.
23. Woman in Shelley's poetry.
24. The romantic element in Charlotte Brontë's novels.
25. The portraiture of male characters in the Brontë novels.
26. In how far does Tennyson embody the faults of the Victorian Age?
27. Tennyson as a writer of dramatic monologues.
28. Is Dickens an idealist?
29. Criminals in Dickens.
30. George Eliot and the woman question.
31. Discuss the female characters in *Adam Bede*.
32. The Preraphaelite Programme, and in how far did the members of the Brotherhood carry it out?
33. Discuss Rossetti's Sonnets.
34. Discuss and illustrate Hardy's use of the irony of circumstances.
35. Man and Nature in *The Return of the Native*.
36. New tendencies in Galsworthy's novels.
37. Galsworthy's attitude towards the well-to-do middle classes expressed in *The Man of Property*.

---

**English Studies at Utrecht.** When, a few years ago, an attempt was made to influence departmental and public opinion in favour of the institution of chairs for modern languages at the University of Utrecht, we opposed the plan on the ground that while the existing faculties at Amsterdam and Groningen are not even adequately equipped, it is futile to create new posts so long as scholars really capable of filling them continue to be so extremely rare. The promoters committed the mistake of begging the question by approaching the tutors giving private courses within the University,

<sup>1)</sup> Inserted by request.

thus rousing expectations which it was not in their power to fulfil. The government policy of retrenchment, then just setting in, caused the scheme to come to nought, but hopes once raised are hard to abandon. An offer made by one of the candidates to ask for no remuneration if the professorial dignity were bestowed upon him, was very properly declined, mere disinterestedness not being considered a sufficient claim to the chair. We now learn that the Genootschap Nederland-Engeland has decided to honour a member of its Committee by appointing him to a professorship of English at Utrecht, the duties of this office to be performed gratis. It is of course the inalienable privilege of any society to confer distinctions upon members for important services rendered. The abnormal thing is, however, that in order to do so, the Genootschap Nederland-Engeland, on whose Committee Anglicists are conspicuous by their absence, should trespass upon ground where it should fear to tread. It has taken an unconscionable time to obtain for modern languages the recognition of their claim to University status. If after this the chairs are to be filled under the auspices of irresponsible bodies by men whose eagerness is more evident than their capacity, and with the connivance of the Universities themselves, it will be the worse for the Universities. This is not a question of persons, it is a question of values, involving larger issues than a mere title. Already a degree in English no longer passes current at face value. If the new dignitary is permitted to hold examinations and to confer degrees, a further depreciation may be looked for in the near future. It is in the interest of English studies in Holland, which alone matter here, that this sort of thing should be publicly discountenanced.

## Translation.

### THE THIEF.

1. From quite a little boy Gerrit had amused himself with quiet stealing, even under the most risky conditions. 2. Now he only took what struck his fancy, but, as a child, he would make off with any object he found lying about. 3. Again and again he was deprived of it and given a good thrashing because he did not yet know how to conceal it or was not quick enough in snatching it. 4. As he grew older he became more cautious. 5. He learned to wait with the patience of a cat watching a mouse, till he saw his chance and then spring on his prey oblivious of everything but the consuming lust to have, to have. 6. At first, when the things were once his own he had no further feeling for them, but presently he took to guarding his treasure jealously, which awakened a new passion in his soul. 7. He could not account for this craving to steal: no sooner did he see a thing than he took it, without thought or hesitation. 8. By degrees he lost interest in everything else. 9. His land became less valuable year by year, his sons robbed him, his mortgage interest and his debts grew, his income diminished. 10. Nothing made him attend to his work; thieving meant more to him than anything else. . . . a source of secret and terrible joy.

11. Once, in a fit of terror, such as sometimes attacked him in his younger years, he secretly confessed to the clergyman that he often took things for the mere pleasure of possessing them. 12. The old clergyman had rated him soundly and shown him the door. 13. Gerrit in his peasant stupidity and unpromptitude of speech had said no more. 14. Soon afterwards the clergyman preached in church against stealing, threatened all thieves with

hell fire and denounced them as monsters of iniquity. 15. This threw Gerrit into an agony of terror, especially as the old clergyman kept looking at him during the sermon. 16. For a time Gerrit had resisted the temptation, but desire ate deeper and deeper into him and gave him no peace. 17. When he saw anything he coveted, the old passion burst into flame. 18. Then the deed. . . . 19. When it was performed he felt relieved; a sense of well-being replaced that of strain. 20. Owing to the clergyman's fulminations Gerrit had never again dared to talk about the subject to a living soul, though at times he had felt inclined to do so. 21. Every week he went punctually to church, as if drawn irresistibly to listen to what was in store for him.

**Observations.** 1. *From early life* Margaret of Navarre accepted many of the Protestant teachings, but never formally broke away from Catholicism. (Upham: French Influence on English Literature p. 59.) Unlike his fellow-calculators he does not seem to have shown any startling development very early in life. (Strand Magazine, X, 279.) I often think that you must have swallowed a ramrod in early life and poor Henry was born with a foot-rod in his inside (Somerset-Maugham: Caesar's Wife). *From his birth up* Adriaan van Goorl had mixed little with Spaniards (L. O. 1914). *From my cradle* I had been brought up among horses. (Strand Magazine, Sept. 1904, p. 273). — *On (in) the most risky spots.* The exact spot on which a murder had been committed (Bennett: Those United States). A lovely woman *in* a rural spot. (Leigh Hunt.) — *Take pleasure in:* I cannot make out what *pleasure* people *take* in seeing things out of their proper place. (Caesar's Wife.) The solace of old age is to *take pleasure in* the youth of those who come after us.

2. *Took (struck) his fancy.* "What do you write about?" "Nothing in particular. I make a saleable page or two of whatever *strikes my fancy.*" (Gissing: New Grub Street I, 33.) The fact is, my lads, I've *taken a fancy* to you both and can't make up my mind to part with you. (Marryat: Jacob Faithful). A spot which had *taken his fancy.* (Hardy: Return of the Native I, 107.) — *On beheard:* A cart stood unattended in the street. (Harmsworth Magazine, Dec. 1898, p. 519.) The machine appeared to be for the moment *taking care of itself.* (R. Freeman: Red Thumb Mark.) A few minutes before noon a dray, with high sides, was left *unmanned* immediately in front of the Sub-Treasury and opposite the Morgan Bank. (Times Weekly Edition, Sept. 24, 1920.) — *Stray object.* We speak of a stray letter, dog, customer, shot, thought. It isn't as though he were a *stray* young man sent you by the Foreign Office. (Caesar's Wife, Act II.) *Unowned thing* does not meet the case.

3. *Every now and then* he rose from his seat. (Strand Magazine, July, 1894, p. 98.) *Every now and then* he raised the gun, but it was too heavy. *Again and again* as I grew older. . . . (Strand Mag. 1894, p. 535.) She came thus when she was not wanted, *again and again* (W. B. Maxwell: The Ragged Messenger I, 27.) — *Flogged, Spanked, Smacked.* The first word is connected with *flagellate*, hence it supposes a stick, whip or the like. The operation of *spanking*, as Fowler elegantly puts it, consists in slapping the buttocks with open hand or slipper. To *smack* a person is to slap his face etc. with palm. (C. O. D.) He was told by the headmaster that if he had not been a new boy he would have been *flogged* for bringing such a book into the school. (Times Weekly Edition, Dec. 26, 1919.) I'll give you the very warmest spanking you ever heard of. (Anstey: Vice Versa.) He gave Ginger a *smack* that nearly knocked his head off. (W. W. Jacobs.) She wants her bottom *smacked*, that's what I say (Richardson: Wisdom, p. 188.) — *He*



*did not yet know to hide it.* Poutsma (Grammar I, Ch. XVIII) writes: "Curious is the use of infinitive-questions opening with *how* after *to know* (= to have acquired an art or trick), *to learn*, *to teach*, where it is hardly possible to think of a desire of enlightenment." The author adds that *how* is not invariably found after these verbs. The only instance by which *know* (without *how*) is illustrated is taken from Milton's 'Comus' (1634): "Well *knows to still* the wild winds when they war." Of course this is not very convincing as the absence of *how* may be due to the exigencies of the metre and Milton's poems can hardly be said to reflect modern English usage. The authors of the Oxford Dictionary seem to consider the use of *how* after *know* essential: "*to know how* (formerly also simply *to know*): to understand the way, or be able (to do something)." It was his profession *to know how* to shut his eyes to things that were inconvenient. (Butler: Way of All Flesh, p. 195.) Already he *knew how* to handle a Mauser. (Stephen Black: The Tiger.) — *Because he was not quick and clever enough in snatching and concealing a thing.*

4. *At a less tender age.* Signs of his wonderful powers appeared at a tender age [in zijn prille jeugd]. (Strand Magazine, X, 278.) — Before he was ten, his sports were interrupted by fits of remorse and despair; and his sleep was disturbed by dreams of fiends trying to fly away with him. *As he grew older* his mental conflicts became still more violent. (Macaulay: Bunyan.)

5. *Lie in wait for:* His main idea was *to lie in wait* somewhere for Dick and try the result of an appeal to his better feelings (Anstey: Vice Versa). I must cool a little and *watch my opportunity* (Landor; quoted by Webster). The Eskimos were *watching* for the whales to appear (Krüger, § 2574). He watched me as a cat does a mouse (N.E.D.). — When I *see a chance* I pay third and ride first (Rattletrap and Tootletum, p. 126). *Saw his opportunity.* *Till the condition was favourable.* In the sense of 'circumstances' the word is always found in the plural: The total eclipse of the moon was observed in Dublin on Tuesday night under exceptionally favourable conditions. See Poutsma's Grammar, Part II, p. 195. — *Pounce on his prey:* Convinced that they had caught their prey, instantly *pounced* upon it (Douglas Jerrold: Men of Character, I, p. 271). The youngster *pounced* at the shilling (Quiller Couch: Wesley, p. 11). Suddenly he *pounced* and gripped the visitor by the body. (Royal Magazine, Oct. 1910, p. 527.) He will *pounce* like a wild beast out of his cage to worry Cranmer (Tennyson: Queen Mary). That the fellow would *spring out upon* me at some sharp turn of the way seemed so certain, that at each sharp angle I halted (Charles Lever: The Confessions of Paul Goslett). — *Forgetful-Oblivious.* According to Günther ('Synonyms') *forgetfulness* is 'proneess to let things slip from the mind, the state of being forgotten'; *oblivion* 'the state of having passed out of the memory, the act of forgetting completely'. The Century Dictionary comments: *Oblivion* is the state into which a thing passes when it is thoroughly forgotten. The use of *oblivion* for the act of forgetting was an innovation of the Latinizing age, which has not won recognition, nor has the "Act of Oblivion" (1660) given *oblivion* currency in the sense of official or formal pardon. *Forgetfulness* is a quality of a person, as a man remarkable for his *forgetfulness*. If *forgetfulness* is ever properly used where *oblivion* would serve, it still seems the act of a person: as to be buried in *forgetfulness*. *Obliviousness* stands for a sort of negative act, a complete failure to remember; as a person's *obliviousness* of the proprieties of an occasion. "No, I won't!" she said impetuously, quite *forgetful* of her previous manner towards the reddleman (Hardy: Return of the Native). So *forgetful* of himself was he under the

terrible blow. (Meredith: *The Egoist*, p. 21.) I must have become entirely *oblivious* of my surroundings. (Strand Magazine, Juli 1894, p. 41.) Morris Holt was one of the most *oblivious* and absent-minded men in the world. (Strand Magazine, Aug. 1894, p. 198.) In novels and uneducated newspapers the word *oblivious* (which means *forgetful*) is used as an equivalent to "unconscious". It is English to say that a person is "unconscious of this or that". Novelists write "oblivious to these happenings" for "unconscious of these occurrences". (Andrew Lang in *Illustrated London News*, March 27, 1909.)

6. *First*—*At first*. The distinction between these two should never be lost sight of. The second expression is equivalent to our in 't eerst; in 't begin, and suggests a contrast: *At first* he wouldn't recognize her, but just lately he's changed round. (Pett Ridge: *Thanks to Sanderson*, p. 275.) I meant to tell you *at first*, but when you thought it was Yolande I thought it was so stupid of you (E. Nesbit: *The Red House*, p. 197). *At first* the Squire hesitated. Eliab's political vagaries had made the thing well nigh impossible. And it was not until he clinched his entreaty with "Dorcas would be so pleased", that the old squire relented. (Hugh Pendexter: *The Old Squire*.) You may not like her *at first* (Elinor Glyn: *The Reason Why*, p. 48). *First* simply expresses order: An electric sign began to work automatically. *First* there was traced on the concave wall of the night the word T H E. (Strand Magazine, April 1920, p. 396.) A thunderstorm *first*, then slow steady rain for hours and hours. (Red House, p. 44.) "Do you think my photograph does me justice?" We gaze *first* upon the features of the maiden who asks the question, and *then* upon the picture she hands us. (Daylight, Nov. 7, 1903.) — The definite article should not be omitted before *things*. In that case it would acquire a vague sense. Poutsma (II, p. 229), quotes Macaulay: "They resolved to bring *things* to a crisis". *Things* looked very black indeed (Sims: *Tales of To-day*, p. 103.) She really had no time for sentiments and memories and *things*. (Strand Magazine, Nov. 1904, p. 506.) The kitchenmaid had been giving old Batt's dessert sweets to the children and Batts had found out and said *things*. (Royal Magazine, Jan. 1904, p. 237.) — *What awakened*. The correct pronoun is *which*. *What* is used as the subject of a clause which forms a comment on the contents of a sentence or clause, but is only employed when the clause precedes or is placed in the body of the sentence. (Poutsma, II, p. 971.) — *Take to*: If he doesn't *take to* baling presently I should say they'll be swamped. (Pearson's Magaz., Oct. 1902, p. 360). American women-bathers with an inclination to embonpoint have *taken to* painting dimples on their knees. (Punch, July 21, 1920.) I have *taken to* write a little in a penny paper called "The Star". (Freeman in W. R. W. Stephens: *Life*.) Their *taking to* smoke tobacco. (Blackwood Magazine, 1890.) She has *taken to* like him. (Meredith: *One of our Conquerors* III, XI, 233.) The Oxford Dictionary defines: to apply oneself to a habitual action, to adopt or take up as a practice, business, habit.

7. *He could not analyze this lust for theft*. Careful to *analyze* their enjoyments (S. Johnson: *Idler* no 18). Till the longing became a greed, a *lust* (Strand Magazine, Sept. 1894, p. 308.). But there still twinkles in her blood-shot blue eyes a youthful *lust* for life which hard usage has failed to stifle (E. O'Neill: *Anna Christie*, Act. I). Mr. Grey, a monster, who fed most gladly upon human flesh and who for the mere *lust* of a big balance-sheet involved all Europe in bloodshed (Newspaper). An uncontrollable *desire* to look at him shook her, but she dominated (Glyn: *His Hour*). Kleptomania is a system of insanity which takes the form of an irresistible *desire* to steal (Everyman Encyclopaedia). Lizzie took him in hand tightly

and for her sake he stifled the drink-cravings. (Strand Magazine, Feb. 1910, p. 189.). Suppose I were to be seized with an unnatural *craving* to go there (Elizabeth and her German Garden, p. 89). The *craving* for the conservation of her freedom took its rise in the fact . . . (Lucas Malet: Adrian Savage I, p. 38.) In each case the cause of unhappiness was unsatisfied love, unsatisfied *craving* for love (Frank Swinnerton: Nocturne p. 42.) — *That lust*. Poutsma observes (II. p. 895): "As to subjects introduced by the speaker or writer himself *this (these)* seems, as a rule, to imply greater interest and closer familiarity on his part than *that (those)*". — *He saw a thing — he took it*.

8. *In time*. Helga and I will have to face that and *in time* she will live it down. (Mrs. Sidgwick: The Lanternbearers, p. 219.). — *Other things gradually failed to interest him*.

9. *Ground-Soil*. For the difference between these two Günther's 'Synonyms' may be consulted. He looked on the *ground* while he answered her (W. Scott: Fair Maid). He stumbled and I came to the *ground* with him. (Mc. Carthy and Praed: Ladies' Gallery II, XI, 214). Boundless stretches of richly cultivated *soil*, intersected by the rivulets of laborious irrigation (Crawford: Mr. Isaacs). If we inquire what those physical agents are by which the human race is most powerfully influenced, we shall find that they may be classed under four heads: namely Climate, Food, *Soil* and the General Aspect of Nature (Buckle: History of Civilization I. 36.). The red sand and *soil* frozen hard. (Fothergill: First Violin p. 140). The *land*, the source of all wealth. (Pitman's Senior Reader). They made him work on the *land* (Deportation of Women p. 56.). Increment values on *land* held by Corporations, which is not liable to death duties must be paid every 15 years. (Jack's Reference Book.). Duty on Undeveloped *Land*: The Finance Act 1909 imposes a tax of one halfpenny in the £ on the site value of undeveloped *land* payable by the owner of any land which has not been developed by the erection of dwelling-houses or of buildings for the purpose of any business, trade or industry other than agriculture (Ibidem). — *His land was let down in cultivation*. — *Mount up*: Your bond mounted up to several lakhs of rupees. (M. Crawford: Mr. Isaacs.). Would you prefer me to apologize every time I tread on your foot or shall I let it *mount up* and apologize collectively? (Strand Magazine; Feb. 1906, p. 208.). But afterwards as the staff *grew* continually smaller, prices continually higher and material continually more scarce, the rate of production inevitably *decreased* (Cambridge Press Bulletin). I thought my pain *grew* less (Somerset-Maugham: Caesar's Wife, Act III.).

10. *There was nothing which*: *Nothing* is usually followed by *that*, this pronoun being the ordinary relative after *thing* and compounds of *thing* and the substantives *little* and *much*. — *His love for stealing excelled everything*. This sentence has an odd look and would be equivalent to our muntte boven alles uit. Love Divine, all loves *excelling*; Joy of Heaven, to Earth come down; Fix in us Thy humble dwelling; All Thy faithful mercies crown (Charles Wesley's Hymn.).

11. The gloomy thoughtfulness which *crept over* him (Sims: Tales of To-day p. 40.). A sense of apprehension *stealing over* him (Oppenheim: The Lighted Way, p. 72.). And then there *came over* the mother an overmastering desire . . . . (Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes: Jane Oglander.). There *came over* my spirit all the keen, collected calmness of despair (Poe: The Pit and the Pendulum). Then a great terror *came over* me. (Sims: Tales of To-day). You will be *seized with* a longing to shriek. (Max O'Rell: John



Bull and His Island p. 99). Consternation has seized the promoters of whist drives around London. (Times Weekly Edition, 14. 1. 1921.). — *In private* (*privacy*): "Monsieur", he faltered, "a word *in private* with you". (Harmsworth Magazine, Aug. 1900. p. 33.). To confer with me *in private*. (S. Butler: The Way of All Flesh p. 222.). Maud began to gnaw her fingers, a disagreeable habit she had *in privacy* (Gissing: New Grub Street I. p. 16). — *Things* should not be preceded by the definite article. Compare Sentence 6! — *Out of sheer love of possession* is correct. *The proprietary feeling he got by it*. "She is tired, poor child", said Sir Henry, with an amorously *proprietary* air (= possessive manner) (Gilbert Cannan: Mummery p. 238.). His toeing and heeling, and all that idiotic speechlessness that set Emmy on her hind legs, was *sheer love of the truth*. (F. Swinnerton: Nocturne, p. 92.).

12. *Had dusted his jacket* could never be taken to mean that he had administered a sharp reprimand; the phrase is equivalent to our "op zijn baadje geven": "Jack, I wish you had dusted his jacket for him . . . we thrashed him once (Vachell: John Charity p. 26). *Had given him a piece of his mind*, that is, had spoken bluntly and unceremoniously; had told him unpleasant truths. The expression is admissible in conversation, but not 'polite' enough to use in written composition. "I'd like to *give Mr. G. a piece of my mind* (Strand Magazine, Oct. 1898. p. 436.) She made no bones about *giving me a piece of her mind* (Royal M., May 1904. p. 435.). The landlady giving a piece of her mind to a butcher-boy (H. R. Haggard). *Had spoken his mind freely*; *had given him a severe talking-to*. I admire the frankness with which you *speak your mind*. (Harmsworth M., Sept. 1899. p. 169.). She *spoke her mind freely* to him. (Strand Mag., Feb. 1904. p. 210.). She needs a brotherly *talking-to* or she gets above herself. (Strand Magazine, July 1911. p. 17.).

13. *Stolid stupidity* would seem a case of redundancy; *stolid* being defined as 'phlegmatic and stupid'. Breul, however, translates the word by "tölpelhaft" (*German Dictionary*) which would bring the sense closer to the idea of rusticity conveyed by our text. The ordinary *stolid* camel face was distorted with demon-like fury. (Windsor M., March 1905). The *stolid* gaze of the constable. (Strand M., X. 479.) The Indian gazed *stolidly* at the strange figure. (Wide World M., Aug. 1908. p. 514.). A *stolid-faced* bevy of half grown-up daughters, just out of the schoolroom (Mrs. Cook: London, p. 307.). — *Had shut up* is far too colloquial. The same remark applies to *had kept his mouth shut*.

14. *Preached in the church*. The definite article is generally absent before the names of buildings when the reference is to the use made of the building. Exceptions to this rule are 'theatre', 'opera'. See Kruisinga's Handbook § 1292-1298. — *Denounce*: At the midday celebration he drove them from the altar rail — *denouncing* them as children of the devil — money-changers. (W. B. Maxwell: The Ragged Messenger, I. p. 65.). Mr. Grayson, who has been busy in the last few days *denouncing* his king and his brethren in the Commons is the Member for the Colne Valley Division (Ill. Lond. News, Oct. 24, 1908.).

15. *That made*. See note to sentence 7. See also Kruisinga's remarks on the use of *this* and *that* in Handbook § 1187, and more particularly § 1196. — *Severe-Rigorous-Strict-Rigid-Austere* and *Stern* are discussed by Günther (Synonyms, Group 526.). — *Kept his eyes fixed on him* is good English but has a different meaning from that borne by the text.

16. It was a cruel feeling; it *ate its way into me*. (Robert Hichens: The Last Time.). — *Did not leave him alone* is not suitable. Why don't these

women *leave me alone*? (Harmsworth M., Aug. 1900. p. 211.). Would you mind *leaving me alone* for a few minutes? Come back when the dance is over. (Askew: Nurse p. 19.). She shakes the cushions out and pats them. "I wish you'd *leave the furniture alone*, Christina." (Somerset Maugham: Caesar's Wife.). "I have come", said the man who was no other than Wildevé. "You *give me no peace*. Why don't you *leave me alone*?" (Hardy: Return of the Native).

17. The *revived* embers of an old passion (Hardy: Return I. 17.) Helga's spirits *revived* as she ran off to do her mother's bidding (Mrs. Sidgwick: The Lanternbearers p. 19.). His respect for L. began to *revive* again (White: The Corner House p. 86.). — *The old passion inflamed*: Fielding was an idealist *inflamed* with a fiery enthusiasm for righteousness. (Fortnightly Review, Nov. 1909.). When any blood was spilled, the sight of it seemed to *inflamm* the animalism in the man. (Twenty-five Years in Seventeen Prisons, p. 58.) I know how soon your noble heart *inflames* when sympathy and humanity appeal to it. (Carlyle: Schiller).

19. A *benevolent feeling* is totally different from a *sense of well-being*. *Benevolence* is simply a disposition to do good, a desire to promote the happiness of others (Oxford English Dictionary.). The ludicrous mistake seems to be due to the unfortunate arrangement of meanings in our dictionaries. He saw nothing uncommon, and no signs of a fastidious taste; yet the whole character of the room, its easy comfort and order and pleasantness, were civilized, and Michael liked civilization . . . While he waited in the room he was conscious of a *well-being* that he had not felt before (Mrs. Sidgwick: The Severins. p. 26.). — *Strain-Suspense-Stress*. In the technical sense a *strain* is the change of form due to a *stress* or pressure. A longitudinal stress in which the forces are in the direction of the length, may be either a pull or a push. The general meaning of *strain*, however, is "force or pressure tending to cause fracture, change of position or alteration of shape" (N. E. D.). In a figurative sense the word is applied to pressure that severely taxes the strength or endurance of a person or thing: It had been rather a *strain* and I was glad to get out again into the open air (Irishman's Difficulties, p. 27.). The reaction that follows all *strain* (Lytton: What Will He Do With It?). (*Mental stress*: In times of mental stress (Strand M., Dec. 1910. p. 755.) At this time of *stress* one of the nation's highest duties is to look after the women. (Nelson: The War. Dec. 12. 1914.). *Suspense* is absolutely unsuitable, as it expresses a state of uncertainty, of apprehensive expectation: The agony of *suspense* grew at last intolerable. (E. A. Poe: The Pit and the Pendulum). Don't keep us in *suspense*. What has gone wrong? (Oppenheim: The Game of Liberty p. 91.). It is not possible to endure this *suspense*. I prefer death fifty times over. (R. L. Stevenson: New Arabian Nights.).

20. *Though at times he had willed to do so*. A strong desire is expressed by the regular verb *to will*. See Kruisinga (Handbook § 451.). This verb is only used in literary English.

21. *Went to church promptly*. *Prompt* means characterized by readiness or quickness; performed at the moment or on the spot; to the minute or fixed time (= sharp). He *promptly* boxed the boy's ears. She must be called *prompt(ly)* at six o'clock. (N. E. D.). — *As if he was drawn* should be 'as if he *were* drawn' (subjunctive). — *What awaited him* has a neutral meaning like *what was in store for him*: What might be *in store for him* if she got wind of his misbehaviour. (Wide World Magazine, Dec. 1908, p. 118.). Think what triumphs are *in store for* British girls! (Harmsworth Magazine, July 1899. p. 518.).

Good translations were received from Miss R. A. C. B., Utrecht; Miss Th. A. v. H., Utrecht; Mr. J. W. H., Almelo; Miss B. J. v. K., Delft; Mr. H. v. L., Twijzelerheide; Mr. A. T. de M., Amsterdam; Mr. A. M., Barneveld; Miss M. P., Utrecht; Mr. M. P., Rauwerd; Miss J. v. d. V., Grouw; Miss M. V., Leeuwarden; Miss C. v. d. W., Breda; Miss M. W., Arnhem; Mr. K. v. d. W., Huizum; Mr. P. W. K. Z., 's Gravenhage.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 94 Voorstraat, Brielle, before July 20<sup>th</sup>. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

1. Het was een aardig huisje in een weinig bezocht hoekje van Normandië in de nabijheid van de zee; een streek van boomgaarden en koolzaadvelden, van zachtgroene weiden, waar runderen graasden en van lange door olmen beschaduwde landwegen.

2. Men verbaasde zich eenigszins dit huisje juist hier te vinden, want alle overige huizen in de buurt waren ruwe boerenwoningen of arbeidershuizen en dit was een coquet villa'tje met witte muren en hooge, smalle vensters en balkons van gedraaid smeedwerk, en jaloezieën: een vroolijk landhuisje, dat stond in een fleurig tuintje te midden van rozenstruiken en geraniumbedden en vlakke grasgazons. 3. Achter den tuin lag een boomgaard, waar rijen knoestige appelboomen zich naar elkaar overbogen als fantastische gestalten, die plotseling midden in een dans tot staan waren gebracht.

4. Een plankje aan den muur gespijkerd, bevestigde met zijn ruwgeschilderde letters de inlichtingen, die ik van een makelaar in Dieppe ontvangen had. 5. Het huis stond te huur en ik was uitgereden — een rijtoer van twee lange uren — om het te bezichtigen. 6. Nu stond ik op de stoep en trok aan de bel, een groote bel, die in de portiek opgehangen was en voorzien van een afhangend bronzen handvat, zóó gesmeed, dat het op een koord met kwast geleek. 7. Het geluid zou ver klinken in die landelijke stilte.

8. Het klonk tenminste tot aan een boerenhuisje met laag rieten dak, dat ongeveer honderd meter verder den weg op gelegen was. 9. Weldra kwamen een man en een vrouw uit het boerenhuis, staarden een oogenblik in mijn richting en kwamen daarop naar mij toe: en oude man en een oude, grijze vrouw: de man met een bombazijnen broek, de vrouw met een wit katoenen muts op en een blauw schort voor; beiden liepen zij met den zwaren gang, die boeren eigen is. 10. Ik legde hun uit, dat ik hun huis kwam bezichtigen. 11. Ze moesten me trouwens verwacht hebben; de makelaar had gezegd, dat hij hun bericht zou sturen. 12. Maar tot mijn groote verbazing scheen deze zakelijke mededeeling hen om de een of andere reden in verwarring te brengen, zelfs, naar het mij voorkwam, verdrietig te stemmen. 13. Ze hieven hun vermoeide, oude gezichten naar me op en wisselden angstige blikken met elkaar. 14. De vrouw sloeg haar handen in elkaar en friemelde zenuwachtig met haar vingers.

15. „Maar de makelaar heeft u toch geschreven? 16. Ik maakte uit zijn woorden op, dat u me vandaag op dit uur zou wachten,” zei ik.

17. „O, zeker,” gaf de man toe, „wij verwachtten u.” 18. Maar hij maakte geen aanstalten verder op de zaak in te gaan.

19. „Is het huis misschien al verhuurd?” opperde ik.

20. „Neen, het huis is niet verhuurd,” zei hij.

## Points of Modern English Syntax.

111. Still, there was one position worse than the present: it was the position he would be in when the ugly secret *was* disclosed. George Eliot, *Silas Marner*, ch. III.

As soon as he was warm he began to think it would be a long time to wait till after supper before he *drew* out his guineas. Ib. ch. V.

What time is expressed by the preterites *was* and *drew*? Hdbk. 94 and 153.

112. This is the history of Silas Marner, until the fifteenth year after he *came* to Raveloe. Ib. ch. II.

What time is expressed by the preterite *came*? Hdbk. 147.

113. Men's hearts had not changed, but they had learned, through the events of that awful year, to submit as cheerfully as might be to the doom which could not be *escaped*. Freeman in Herrig-Förster, British Authors, p. 104,



Is this a usual passive? Hdbk. 168.

114. It was whispered about that the first cause of the outbreak (the fire) was a bottle of turpentine which was being used, or *proposed to be used*, in the pickling of an unpopular boy by his fellows. De Morgan, *Vance*, ch. 12.

The passive construction looks like a nominative-and-passive infinitive; but it is not. The corresponding active would be: *It was proposed to use the bottle*, etc. See Hdbk. 166, where this case is not mentioned but an essentially identical construction is fully illustrated.

115. It was all ranged upon a slope, was this old garden. Temple Thurston, *Thirteen*, III. What reason is there to repeat the auxiliary? Hdbk. 301.

116. But where *could* he be at this time, and on such an evening, leaving his supper in this stage of preparation, and his door unfastened? *Silas Marner*, ch. IV. What is the function of *could*? Hdbk. 326.

117. Progress might be slow, but it was sure . . . Dr. Hall might snort when he heard of it, asking, with a growl, what a soldier wanted with a tooth-brush; but the good work went on. Strachey, *Eminent Victorians*, p. 132f.

What is the function of *might*? The case resembles that of Hdbk. 386, 2b.

118. For many months, the average of deaths during these voyages was 74 in the thousand; the corpses were shot out into the waters; and who *shall* say that they were the most unfortunate? *Ib.* p. 128.

What is the function of *shall*? Hdbk. 417.

119. At first some of the surgeons *would* have nothing to say to her, and, though she was welcomed by others, the majority were hostile and suspicious. *Ib.* p. 132.

Is *would* modal or not? Hdbk. 440 (but the statement about the stress of *would* is shown by this example to be untenable).

120. He began to think it (i.e. the money) was conscious of him, as his loom was, and he *would* on no account have exchanged those coins, which had become his familiars, for other coins with unknown faces. *Silas Marner*, ch. II.

Is *would* modal or not? Hdbk. 442 a.

121. Even cranks have their use if only our professional organization learns how to use them aright. *Times Ed. Suppl.* 8/7, 1929.

Is the infinitive with *how* to be looked upon as an adjunct or as an object? Hdbk. 476.

122. We have allowed nature to become strange to us, and are on that account very impressionable to her surfaces. *Times Lit.* 13/72, 23.

And what the difficulties of explanation were I leave you to imagine! De Morgan, *Vance*, ch. II.

Marner wanted the heaps of ten to grow into a square. *Silas Marner*, ch. II.

Have we cases of an object and infinitive here, or must we consider them as accusatives with an infinitive? Hdbk. 484ff.

123. The Countess was announced to be imminent. Bennett, *Card*, ch. I.

Once on a time all roads were assumed to lead to Rome, and once on a time they certainly did, so far as these islands of ours are concerned. *Times Lit.*, 19/5, 21.

What passive construction is illustrated by these quotations? Hdbk. 502.

124. The death of King William *may be regarded as having closed* an era of our history. McCarthy, *History of our own Times*.

This may be looked upon as an alternative of the nominative-and-infinitive; see 123.

125. Long ago the heap of coins had become too large for the iron pot to hold them. *Silas Marner*, ch. II.

What part of the sentence is *for the iron pot*? Hdbk. 516ff.

126. This helped to account not only for there being more profusion than finished excellence in the holiday provisions. *Ib.* ch. III.

What is the function of *there*? Hdbk. 623.

127. Some arrangements must have been made between the Doctor and my Mother about my furbishing up for Penguin's (a public school). De Morgan, *Vance*, ch. 11.

Discuss the voice of the gerund. Hdbk. 603.

128. In that case, as soon as ever there is a vacant seat, he takes the opportunity to get himself elected. Gill, *Government and the People*, p. 108.

What construction is used after *to get*? Hdbk. 697.

129. And watching Stanley buttoning his braces, she grew enthusiastic. Galsworthy, *Freelands*, ch. 8.

It was jolly to watch his eyes twinkle and his thin cheeks puff out. *Ib.* p. 95.

Compare the two constructions after *to watch*. Hdbk. 703.

130. This confusion cannot be ended by the mere assertions of artists, who often fall into it themselves. Being the result of the misuse of the intellect, only the intellect, rightly used, can destroy it. *Times Lit.* 2/11; 22.

Discuss the use of *being*. Hdbk. 728.

131. But I was willing to accommodate you by undertaking to sell the horse, seeing it's not convenient to you to go so far to-morrow. *Silas Marner*, ch. III.

Is it possible to call *seeing* another part of speech than a participle? Handbook 731.

132. (The rooms) might be made capable of accommodating several hundred beds. Strachey, *Eminent Victorians*, p. 135.

Account for the singular *hundred*. Hdbk. 849.

133. Now all is polish, on which no yesterday's dust is ever allowed to rest. *Silas Marner*, ch. 17.

Does *no* qualify *yesterday* or *dust*? What conclusion do you draw from your answer with respect to the genitive? Hdbk. 900.

134. I have never, when I could have done so, taken the trouble to read original reviews of this little book; and am not now in a position to do it. Saintsbury in *Essays by Members of the English Association*, vol. VI p. 52.

What is the function of *so*? Hdbk. 1041.

135. The messengers were already hurrying off to Kensington Palace to bear to his successor her summons to the throne. McCarthy, *History of our own Times*, p. 1.

Are the possessives subjective or objective? Hdbk. 1077.

136. *That* which to us seems a lean and barren sentence, was to them the text for a winter evening's entertainment. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. Plummer II, p. XXI. I have never tried, but I know *those* who have. I know *those* who are still trying. Temple Thurston, *Thirteen*, I p. 3.

Are the antecedent pronouns used in the same function in these sentences? Hdbk. 1189 and 1190.

137. It is a question of scale, of course. The new scale may perhaps be as easily justified as *that* which the author of the three Garibaldi books had accustomed us to expect from him. *Times Lit.* 15/5, 22.

What is the function of *that* here? Hdbk. 1199.

138. The "Purveyor", of course, pointed out that, according to the regulations, all soldiers should bring with them into hospital an adequate supply of clothing. Strachey, *Eminent Victorians*, p. 134.

Why is there no article before *hospital*? Hdbk. 1292.

139. Yet even in this stage of withering a little incident happened, which showed that the sap of affection was not all gone. *Silas Marner*, ch. II.

What is the function of *all*? Hdbk. 1319.

140. "We can't receive any visitors now", she said in the voice of one who repeats. Temple Thurston, *Thirteen*, III.

What is the function of *one*? Could it be replaced by *someone*? Hdbk. 1362.

## Reviews.

*An Enquiry on a Psychological Basis into the Use of the Progressive Form in Late Modern English.* By J. VAN DER LAAN. Academisch Proefschrift. Gorinchem, 1922. Pp. 135.

The older writers on the rise and subsequent development of the so-called Progressive Form have all laid stress on two predominant characteristics:

1. the idea of limited duration (duration within a certain space of time, expressed in the sentence or implied. Cf. Sweet, N. E. G., § 2213).

2. that of incompleteness. (Sweet, § 2211.)

Mätzner, *Englische Grammatik*, (II, p. 55) speaks of 'die Bedeutung des dermaligen Verharrens oder Begriffenseins in einer Tätigkeit', Schmidt, *Grammatik der Englischen Sprache* (§ 331) of 'die Tätigkeit des Verbums als eine zur Zeit noch fortdauernde, nicht vollendete', Krüger, *Syntax der Englischen Sprache* (§ 2347 ff) calls the Progressive Form 'die Dauerform' and Åkerlund, *On the History of the Definite Tenses in English*, Lund 1911 (p. 96), sums up the outcome of his research by saying that 'the main functions of the definite tenses have through all periods been the same, namely actuality' (by which he means that an action or a state is going on at a certain point of time) 'and qualified duration' (going on for a certain length of time.)

Most of these grammarians, however, were aware that these two leading principles were insufficient to explain the extensive use and the various applications of the Progressive Form. Sweet felt that there are cases where the definite and indefinite tenses are only vaguely differentiated and Åkerlund in the introductory remarks to the above-mentioned essay admits that he is 'tempted to say' the difference is often too delicate 'to allow of being properly analyzed'.

That these investigations have not led to more satisfactory conclusions is undoubtedly due to the fact that all the scholars have founded their explanations nearly exclusively on the historical-logical basis. As a matter of course such a method was bound to prove inadequate to explain all the features of such a most flexible and evasive stylistic phenomenon as the use of the periphrastic tenses. Language is a medium of expression with a life of its own and it cannot be studied apart from certain psychological processes in the minds of those who use it. After all that has been written upon this subject during the last fifty years we may safely assume that not even 'the most sober-minded philologist' will entirely neglect this side of linguistic studies nowadays. Therefore it makes a peculiar impression that Mr. van der Laan has thought it necessary to insert the following remark to justify his method of investigation (p. 2): 'The term "psychology" need not deter any one. The writer of a modern novel, the historian, . . . all venture on the field of psychology. . . . Why should not the linguist provided with suitable training and critical insight try to do the same within his province?' This observation sounds rather common-place on the threshold of a psychological linguistic treatise in the year 1922. The quotation from Western's review of Deutschbein's *System der Neuenglischen Syntax* that 'die sprache lange nicht so philosophisch ist, wie sie die sprachmeister machen wollen' (v. d. L. p. 3) does not condemn the psychological treatment as such but rather the overstepping the limits of moderation, which, as every student of language knows, is not an entirely imaginary danger.

After a short survey of the use of the P. F. in earlier stages of the language, Mr. v. d. L. lays down the general principles on which his theory is founded.



He quotes a passage from James, *Principles of Psychology*, to support his statement that attention is the essential condition for conscious observation. Consciousness is 'a cognitive relation between subject and object which is always attended with some *pleasant* or *unpleasant* affection of the subject by its contact with the object' (p. 15). Now 'the *progressive form* might almost be called the *conscious form* of the verb, because it implies not only that the mind is attentive to what is going on, but it also implies the feelings of *interest*, *dislike*, *impatience*', which the psychological object rouses in the observer's mind. As soon as the interest begins to flag, the S. T. is used.

This is the pivot of Mr. v. d. L.'s theories. It cannot fail to strike the reader that such a statement must from its very nature remain a mere hypothesis and that the facts that are quoted can only illustrate his theory but can never prove it.

In discussing his topic the writer wants to consider two elements:

1. the nature of the action.
2. the mind of the observer.

Only the first element has been discussed at large in all the previous disquisitions on the subject but the 'second or *subjective* element has hardly found any recognition at all' he says (p. 13). He only adds in a note that some continental grammarians have thought it necessary to devote some attention to it and have called it the *intensive* use of the P. F. This statement, however, is hardly in accordance with the facts. I subjoin a short survey of what has been written on this side of the question during the last few years:

Mr. v. d. L. himself mentions the observation made by Onions in § 13.c of his *Advanced English Syntax*: 'The Continuous forms are sometimes used idiomatically without implying anything "continuous"... they give an emotional colouring to the sentence', Deutschbein's remarks in his *System der Neuenglischen Syntax* (§§ 32, 33), two articles in *Anglia Beiblatt* (Arvid Smith, *Eine bisher unbeachtete Funktion der P. F.* A.B. XXVIII and Bernhard Fehr, id. XXIX) and Bergeder's essay: *Die Periphrastische Form des Englischen Verbums im 17 Jahrhundert*, Diss. Halle 1915. But besides these there are three other treatises: Valerie Marinoff, *Die Periphrastische Form des Englischen Verbums in ihrer Verwendung als Intensivum in dem Modernen Sprachgebrauch*, Diss. Halle 1915, giving copious material from modern authors, the excellent paper partly on the same aspect of the P. F. by Ph. Aronstein in *Anglia* XLII, and Mr. Poutsma's book *The Characters of the English Verb and the Expanded Form*, Groningen 1921.<sup>1)</sup> Some of the conclusions drawn by Miss Marinoff are very similar to those Mr. v. d. L. comes to.

Of course it cannot be denied that in the majority of the examples adduced by V. Marinoff and v. d. L. there is an unmistakable emotional connotation. But that it should be expressed in the sentence by the P. F. is a statement that is open to doubt. It would be an easy task to find an equal number of instances where the P. F. is not used though it is apparent from the general purport of the sentence that there is a decided, even a strongly marked, emotional element. When drawing such conclusions, the writers ascribe to the expressive power of a verbal construction what can only be attributed to the whole sentence or the general trend of the passage. To explain the extensive use of the P. F., even in the case of verbs whose meaning is incompatible with the idea of sustained activity, we must start

<sup>1)</sup> It is mentioned a few times by v. d. L. but never on this side of the subject.

from the analytic nature of the construction as some previous investigators have done.<sup>1)</sup> The combination of the auxiliary *to be* and the participle which has more or less an adjectival character is pre-eminently adapted to throw the *nature* of the action into relief and impart to it a greater degree of vividness. Åkerlund (p. 33) observes that 'the periphrasis gives a stronger inner stress to the verb than the indefinite forms' and 'the definite tenses have, in not a few cases, a pronounced intensive character' and Aronstein (p. 31) writes: *der verbalbegriff als solcher wird aus irgend einem grunde besonders hervorgehoben, vergegenständlicht, objektiviert*. Mr. Poutsma calls this particular aspect of the P. F. *the Relieving Function* (to relieve = to bring into relief, to render prominent.)<sup>2)</sup>

In most of the sentences quoted by v. d. L. to support his statements the use of the P. F. might sufficiently be accounted for by saying that the action is in progress e. g. 'When the Prince came home he asked after his wife. She *is sleeping*, said the Queen.' (p. 24). Of course this does not exclude the idea of emotion but such sentences do not show that the use of the P. F. is due to it. Only those verbs which reject the use of it under ordinary circumstances are of practical importance for our purpose, e. g. I can hate; I remember once lying sleepless when I *was hating* my enemy all night (Krüger, *Syntax*.) They *were wishing* to hold back time with both hands. (B. Harraden, *Ships*.) The P. F. is used with these verbs even though their meaning precludes it, to give due prominence to the nature of the action which has left a strong impress on the observer's mind.

In this connection it may be mentioned that Mr. v. d. L. continually speaks of the subjective feelings, the so-called subjective reflex being expressed in the sentence by the P. F. If he thinks, however, that these feelings should naturally find their corresponding expression in speech or in writing, he commits a psychological mistake. Not the affection of the mind by that on which the attention is concentrated is the criterion but the *more or less* conscious desire on the part of the observer. Not what he feels but what he wants to express. If he wants to enhance the effect by marking the action as a process, he uses the P. F., the S. F. states the bare fact. This will explain the use of the simple form in sentences like: *Down* it fell, *On* he walked, *Out* he came (§ 76). I do not agree with v. d. L.'s statement that 'front-position of the adverb imparts to the verbs an emphatically stated notion of duration or degree of perfectivity which prohibits the use of the P. F.' The writer's attention is entirely taken up by the direction in which the action progresses, not by the action itself.<sup>3)</sup> Cf. also v. d. L.'s example in § 95: 'Forgive me, Father for I have sinned'. (not: 'I have been sinning'). The thoughts of the speaker are not with the action but with the sinful state resulting from it.

When Mr. v. d. L. tries to analyse the particular shade of emotion which the P. F. serves to express, he is of course on very delicate ground. If it is not expressed or implied in the sentence there is plenty of room for making all kinds of arbitrary distinctions. Let me quote a few examples from his treatise:

<sup>1)</sup> Aronstein, p. 30, Poutsma, § 23.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. also Sweet's remark that the definite tenses are sometimes used 'to make the narrative more vivid and picturesque so that they have come to have what we may call descriptive force' (N. E. G. § 2209).

<sup>3)</sup> With the verb *to fall* it is a slightly different case. It is generally not used in the P. F. owing to its mutative character. As soon as it changes its meaning and becomes durative it may take that form. Cf. *he fell from the roof* and *the balloon was falling*.

In the sentence: 'He was discovering for the first time the soul of a girl' (§ 35), the subjective feeling is interpreted as surprise. There is nothing to justify this. On page 115 in 'What *have* you *been doing* all this morning, asked my lady, *not wasting* your time I hope? No, my lady, *I've been altering* the blue dress', the P. F. is called the more polite form of interest (sic!). Another clear instance will be found on the same page: 'That same evening Bernardine told the Disagreeable Man the history of the afternoon. He *had been developing* photographs and had heard nothing [*Suggests: when I am developing I cannot attend to anything else*<sup>1)</sup>]. The assertion in § 66<sup>2)</sup> that the substitution of *a knife* by *his knife* would make the use of the P. F. obligatory appears to me rather fanciful.

Now to the other side of the subject: the nature of the action going on. The outcome of psychological research may help us to solve linguistic problems and I quite agree with Mr. v. d. L. that in the case of the P. F. only an investigation on a psychological basis can lead to satisfactory results. But the psychological element should never transgress its proper limits and the student should always bear in mind that he has to start from the linguistic facts, has to collect and sift them carefully before drawing his conclusions.

I do not think that Mr. v. d. L. has followed this method. After having stated that conscious observation is the fundamental principle for the use of the P. F., he enumerates the various objective conditions which tend to rouse attention as he has found them in Dr. Arnold's book: *Attention and Interest* and proceeds to prove that the P. F. is used when one of these is expressed by the verb. This is of course a glaringly superficial way of procedure. The writer is now from the very beginning hampered by prejudices he has thus loaded upon him. He is constantly forced to adapt his quotations to his own foregone conclusions and in doing so, is bound to contradict himself.

According to Dr. Arnold the objective conditions that make the observer take an interest in the action are:

1. Difference (quality, intensity, extensity.)
2. Change (quality, intensity, extensity.)
3. Pleasure, pain.
4. Time.

Of these four Mr. v. d. L. thinks he may eliminate the first and third, the first as having no bearing on the subject in hand 'because the transitional element is lacking', the third as having been fully dealt with when discussing the subjective element. It is obvious that here the writer confuses the two sides of the question himself. The 'pleasure' or 'pain' refers to the condition of the psychological object, not to the observer's mind.

Change is of paramount importance to stimulate and sustain a person's interest which begins to flag as soon as the psychological object begins to show an aspect of permanence or uniformity. Consequently 'verbs and verbal forms denoting *transition* often take the Progressive Form' whereas 'the simple form of the verb is eminently adapted to convey the impression of unchanging *permanence*'. (§ 13, § 14).

Of course this statement required restriction. Verbs denoting an action of a momentaneous nature (to arrive, to leave, to part, to kill etc.) reject the

<sup>1)</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>2)</sup> The passage is too long to quote.



use of the P. F. in spite of the fact that they denote actions pregnant with change. The reason is that some duration is necessary to turn mere perception into conscious observation. Moreover the action, state or process must not be finished during the time of observation as this would make it lose its perceptive interest. Here Mr. v. d. L. drags in the two functions on which the older grammarians have laid so much stress: *limited duration* and *incompletion*.

That these are indeed the two determinant factors and not 'change' or 'permanence' appears from the writer's own examples. Among the verbs he adduces to prove his assertion are: to part, to begin, to become, to open, to turn. Though they always denote change, they are generally used in the S. F. Only if the context imparts to them a different shade of meaning, as in Mr. v. d. L.'s examples, the P. F. can be used. The verb *to break* does not allow of the P. F. when it is perfective, but in: 'The wreck, even to my unpractised eye, *was breaking* up. I saw that she *was parting* in the middle, and that the life of the solitary man upon the mast *hung*<sup>1)</sup> by a thread' (p. 21), *to break* and *to part* are not momentaneous, but have durative force. The use of the P. F. in: 'He shall repent, said she. Even now his eyes *are opening*, his heart is softening' may be explained in the same way. To open does not express a momentary action but the gradual development of a process.

According to Mr. v. d. L. the initial stage of an action is expressed by the P. F. because of the transitional character (§ 52). He wants to demonstrate that the P. F. often has inchoative force. One of the examples is the following sentence from Greene's *Short History*: 'The country *was slowly turning* against him'. Does *was turning* really express the initial stage of an action? The verb *to turn*, being usually momentaneous, has again changed its meaning and expresses a series of changes leading to a definite result. Hence the use of the P. F.

'Modern English has developed a special form to designate the initial stage of an action or state, namely: *to be beginning to*' (p. 52). This inchoative force, however, is inherent in the meaning of the verb *to begin* and the S. F. would express it just as well.<sup>2)</sup> In such sentences as: 'In Cockney English (a:) is beginning to be rounded', (p. 21) the P. F. is again used because the verb has become durative.

Also the final stage of an action or state is often expressed by the P. F. (v. d. L. § 53). To my mind the examples on p. 54 are entirely inadequate to prove this. I subjoin three of them:

'You will write to me if *you are approaching* the truth, will not you?

They *were nearing* the shore.

The end *is drawing near*.'

In none of these sentences does the verbal form really express *the final stage* of an action. On the contrary, in all of them it is represented as being in full swing.

The writer adds that this function of the P. F. is called by Mr. Poutsma the *prospective function* (*Characters of the English Verb* B § 29) because 'it represents the consummation of that action as prospective'. A careful comparison of his examples and those of Poutsma and Aronstein (p. 45) will convince him that it has nothing to do with it.

<sup>1)</sup> The use of the S. F. of *to hang* is sufficiently explained by the weak activity it denotes.

<sup>2)</sup> Verbs like *to commence*, *to come*, *to fall*, *to get*, *to grow* and others may have the same function. Cf. Deutschbein, *System*, p. 69.

It follows quite naturally from Mr. v. d. L.'s theories that the S. F. is used in descriptions, for 'whenever our attention is directed towards a complex object, . . . . the composing elements must needs suffer in clearness and distinctness' (p. 17), unless a strongly stimulating effect enlarges the field of observation (subjective side.) In the same way the writer explains that the S. F. is used to denote a sequence of events (cumulative impressions). The passage from *The Prisoner of Zenda* (p. 6ö) is not an instance in point: it is a description of events, only in the last sentence the story progresses. This statement, however, is only true in the main. Of several successive events some may take the P. F. others the S. F. This depends again on the greater or less degree of significance the speaker (writer) attaches to the action and consequently with what amount of vividness he *wants to represent it* (more or less conscious desire). If one action is entirely subservient to the other, the S. F. is used for the least predominant.

What Mr. v. d. L. says about the use of the P. F. in the Perfect Tenses does not differ much from what we find in other grammars. When the present perfect serves to denote that an occurrence is connected with the present by its results, the P. F. is used. This is about the same as we find in Sweet, N. E. G. § 2211, where a difference is made between *What have you been doing all day?* (incompletion) and *What have you done to-day* (= what have you completed to-day?) The same view is held by Krüger, *Syntax*, § 2356.

Mr. v. d. L. rightly observes that the P. F. may also be used when the action is completed if only the results lead our thoughts back to the action. If the thought of the action still prevails in the speaker's mind and his attention is more with the action than with the results, the P. F. is usual, for instance in Deutschbein's example: 'My dear Mrs. M., you have been listening to tales'. The periphrastic form is used here as an expedient to enhance the effect.

The writer's observations on the use of the periphrastic future tenses (§ 98) call for no special remarks. In § 26 he comments on the rather common practice of using the P. F. of the present for the future. At first it probably expressed that the preparations for the future action were already in progress, but this notion has entirely got dimmed in many cases so that it may now merely denote what Mr. v. d. L. calls 'anticipatory interest or a vivid feeling of expectancy'.

The last few pages deal with the frequent use of the P. F. behind modal auxiliaries, of which extensive lists have been given by Bergeder, p. 75 ff, Marinoff, p. 15 ff, Aronstein, p. 65ff. In § 108 Mr. v. d. L. distinguishes between the use of *must* in *I must go* and *tell him* and *I must be going*. Referring to Bradley's explanation in the N. E. D. sub *must* 3 he says that *must* in the first sentence expresses: 'a necessity imposed by the will of the speaker or relative to some specified end, in the second 'objective necessity'. Bradley's statement, however, only refers to the third person and it goes without saying that it cannot be applied to the first. Surely Mr. v. d. L. does not mean to say that in '*I must go at once*' the auxiliary expresses the will of the speaker? Of course it may express the will of another person e. g. *I must go now, mother told me to come home before six o'clock* (subjective necessity). On the other hand *must* may also denote a necessity imposed by circumstances e. g. *I must go now, I am too busy to stay any longer* (objective necessity).<sup>1)</sup> The same two kinds of necessity may be expressed by *I must be going now*.

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. Kruisinga, *Handbook*, 434.

This does not exclude a difference between the two constructions. The P. F. is again used to render the action more prominent and consequently to soften down the meaning of the auxiliary.

Though Mr. v. d. Laan's treatise contains some original remarks worth considering, I cannot help thinking that on the whole it will not prove very useful to the student who wants to study this difficult and comprehensive part of English grammar. The writer repeatedly falls into the error of asserting things and drawing conclusions for which there is no sufficient evidence.

Groningen.

A. BOSKER.

---

*De Tragedie van Johan van Oldenbarnevelt* naar het Engelsch van JOHN FLETCHER en PHILIP MASSINGER, vertaald door A. J. BARNOUW, Koningin Wilhelmina Professor, Columbia University, New York City. Uitgegeven door J. M. Meulenhoff, Amsterdam 1922.

In the Preface to the translation of *The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt* Professor Barnouw speaks of the appreciation of the figure of the great statesman by the church and the man in the street, in opposition to that of the poets.

The man in the pulpit blinded by party zeal launched his unscrupulous libels against his victim, eagerly followed by the ballad-singers in their scurrilous ballads. They are no impartial judges in that age of political and theological hatred, but Barnavelt was soon to find other vindicators.

The poet, who understands human nature better, judges with love and mercy. In Holland Vondel was soon to acquit Barnavelt in his allegorical play *Palamedes*, but Vondel saw no guilt in his hero. Barnavelt, guiltless, falls a victim to the hate and low passions of his persecutors, so that his fall excites in us only horror and no tender emotions. Verwey conceived Barnavelt's fall as a tragedy of fate; he saw in it the struggle between the old form of government and the new. It was inevitable that the old statesman should fall; his fall, however, was not due to Maurice's hate or Barnavelt's pride and bad fortune, but to the new spirit of the coming period. The English dramatists, whose only sources were the pamphlets of the day, present their hero as a great and dignified figure, who is led to his destruction by his overbearing ambition and thirst of glory. This conception ranks the English play as a tragedy of guilt and its punishment. Dr. Barnouw praises the dramatists for taking the Advocate's figure out of the frame of scurrilous pamphlets and bringing him on the stage as a noble hero worthy of high tragedy.

Professor Barnouw does not agree with Professor Fruin's opinion that the motive of the action is unconvincing. The statesman's power is absolute as a monarch's, and Barnavelt need not fear that he is going to lose his power or his position as the first statesman in the republic; the Prince is very modest and content with the place he occupies as the first Soldier and a servant to the States. But in Dr. Barnouw's opinion the ambitious statesman could not weigh the Prince's words and deeds with the composure of the spectator. It is enough that Barnavelt believed that the Prince's purpose was to destroy his power. I agree with Prof. Fruin; though the Advocate may be blinded by ambition, his arguments for the conspiracy must appear futile. His own words prove this, when he says: "Shall I then suffer the peoples thancks and paires to have another obiect?"



Even the Advocate's friends admit the futility of his motives; Modesbargen answers: "and for what? Glory, the popular applause, fine purchase for a gray beard to deale in".

There is a flaw in the characterization of the hero, to which Professor Koeppl has already drawn attention. He calls Barnavelt's conduct, when the statesman instigates Leidenberch to suicide to get rid of him, an action by which the hero "uns menschlich entfremdet wird". Dr. Barnouw defends this characterization, arguing that a highly ambitious man like Barnavelt would not shrink from sacrificing to his own greatness a weak instrument that had been useful to him. We must not ask, whether his conduct excites our sympathy, but whether we can understand this in a nature driven to the last extreme. Moreover, the ruthless act is redeemed by the consideration that he helps his victim to end an unsympathetic life in a noble manner.

I think Prof. Koeppl is right; I have spoken at some length of Barnavelt's character in the introduction to my edition of the play<sup>1)</sup> and attributed this inconsistency in Barnavelt's character to the joint authorship. Fletcher was inconsistent in painting his characters, and it even happened that he spoiled the conception of his coadjutors. Boyle has remarked that in *The Honest Man's Fortune* he made a despicable figure of Montague, who was painted by Tourneur and Massinger as a gentleman. Barnavelt suffers the same fate; the conception of the character laid down by Massinger in the first act is not sustained by Fletcher. I do not believe that Fletcher, who was careless in drawing his characters, ever gave a thought to the consideration that Barnavelt in this way helped Leidenbergh to end his life nobly. The Advocate's own words prove that he is only thinking of getting rid of a dangerous accomplice in order to attain higher glory. He is depicted as a wily schemer aware of the treacherous course he is going to take:

"Now Barnavelt, thou treadst the subtlest path  
the hardest, and the thorniest, most concerns thee,  
that ere thy carefull course of life run through".

His end is clear:

"which if it speed  
and take but sure hold, I ayme it at,  
I make no doubt, but once more like a comet,  
to shine out faire, and blaze prodigiously  
even to the ruyn of those men that hate me".

Touching upon the authorship of the play, Dr. Barnouw does not throw any new light upon the question; he speaks of the characteristics of Fletcher's versification: the end-stopt lines, the great number of double endings and the accented eleventh syllable. Massinger's versification shows the characteristics of the rhetorical style; the double endings are fewer and his run-on lines make his verse more flowing. Dr. Barnouw speaks of Massinger's habit of self-repetition in phraseology, mentioning that more than a thousand rhetorical phrases occur repeatedly in his plays. They have been collected by R. Boyle in *Englische Studien*. Massinger's hand is also traced in his political allusions; Massinger's love of treating political questions is well-known to students familiar with this author's work. Dr. Barnouw ascribes the conception and construction of the play to Massinger's hand; the kaleidoscopic succession of scenes depicting incidents are assigned to Fletcher, who was a master of stage effects. Two of these scenes mentioned as Fletcher's belong according to the critics to Massinger's hand, namely

<sup>1)</sup> page CIII.

the scene of the burghers and the women decorating Barnavelt's house <sup>1)</sup> and the scene of the ambassadors mediating in behalf of the Advocate. <sup>2)</sup>)

Speaking of the sources Dr. Barnouw mentions, besides the pamphlets referred to by Bullen, a pamphlet *a true Discovery of those treasons of which Geilis van Ledenberch was a Practiser*, and a ballad *Murther vnmasked, or Barnevilles base Conspiracie*, the whole of which is printed in the Preface. In my study of the sources I have drawn attention to other pamphlets: *The necessary and living Discourse of a Spanish Counsellor*; *Barnevelt displayed or the golden Legend of New St. John*; *Ledenberch his Confessions and how he murdered himself*, and others, of which *the Golden Legend* is of high importance, as the dramatists copied long passages verbally from this source.

In 1883 Bullen discovered the manuscript of *The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt* and edited the play in his *Collection of Old English Plays*. The next year Prof. Fruin gave a reprint of this edition with a preface in the Dutch language. The first translation of the play appeared in 1885, by Prof. C. W. Opzoomer. In 1922 appeared the new edition from the manuscript, <sup>3)</sup> and it is a matter of regret that probably owing to the simultaneous appearance of this edition and Dr. Barnouw's work, Dr. Barnouw has taken for his translation the old edition, which is practically out of date. This is to be regretted for two reasons. In the first place the errors printed by Bullen and corrected in the new edition have been suffered to remain in the translation. I mention some examples. In the line: "and tempests of your owne tongue, and the Soldiers now onely fill your sailes" <sup>4)</sup> the scribe wrote "trumpets" by mistake, but seeing his error, he deleted the word and substituted "tempests"; Bullen printed "trumpets", and the result is the translation "en 's legers en uw eigen tongs trompetten nog slechts uw zeilen vullen", which is of course incorrect. Another misreading is: "you were lou'd yet but for your ends", instead of: "you nere lou'd yet but for your ends", <sup>5)</sup> the translation: "nog had me' U lief waar niet uw end zoo boos" alters the sense materially and hardly fits in the context. The line "theis wrongs are shot so neere mine honor, I feare, my person too" <sup>6)</sup> is translated incorrectly by "Ik vrees ook voor mijn persoon" owing to the faulty punctuation. Bullen did not print the commas after "honour" and "fear". It is clear that the Prince did not express any fear for his person, for his great courage is mentioned several times in the play; he says himself "I that nere feard an army in the field, can I shake at their poore whispers? shall I shrink now shot with a rumour?" <sup>7)</sup> It is also clear that the prince is not in fear of his life, for he adds immediately: "so the State suffer not I am as easie to forget".

In the second place the deleted passages to the number of a hundred and ten lines, which are of special interest from a censorship point of view, have been restored in the new edition but for a few words; it is a great pity that the restored passages do not occur in the Dutch version.

<sup>1)</sup> IV, 4

<sup>2)</sup> V, 1.

<sup>3)</sup> *The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*, anonymous Elizabethan play edited from the manuscript with introduction and notes by WILHELMINA P. FRIJLINCK. H. Milford, London 1922.

<sup>4)</sup> Act I, sc. 3, l. 480.

<sup>5)</sup> Act I, sc. 3, l. 523.

<sup>6)</sup> Act I, sc. 3, l. 362.

<sup>7)</sup> Act IV, sc. 2, l. 1852.

There are some interpretations which I consider to be incorrect. The line "as I vse this, I weigh you"<sup>1)</sup> is translated "dit lezend weeg ik U". I have explained in my notes that we are to understand that Barnavelts tears up the petition in scorn and answers "I esteem you no higher than I do this paper"; there was no need for him to read the petition. The line "when we took them on" is translated by "toen wij ze polsten";<sup>2)</sup> the meaning is "when we enlisted them"; the sense attached to it by Dr. Barnouw does not occur in the N.E.D. I have explained the next line in my notes "famished for want of provision (for the support of persons in service, especially soldiers)". I consider the translation "lang gespeend van elk verzet" very obscure. The translation of the words "theis hissing tosts"<sup>3)</sup> into "die sijfelende padden" is an entirely free rendering. I explained "toasts" in my notes as "drunkards" because this was the besetting sin of Dutch people in the eyes of the English. Professor Moore Smith, who reviewed the notes,<sup>4)</sup> suggested the meaning of the N.E.D. "heat" used in "hotte as a toste", the Arminians are also called firebrands in l. 1010; the translation would then be "stokers, stokebranden". The second part of line 886 Dr. Barnouw takes to belong to the preceding speech: "De Prins is boos. Duidt gij het hem euvel? Gij waart het daadlijk".<sup>5)</sup> The explanation I offer of "to rouse" is "to excite to vigorous action;" the words refer to the next lines, you will soon excite the old faithful companies to assist the Prince; the meaning of "to get angry" for "to rouse" does not occur in the N.E.D.; in this way "will" cannot be explained either. I have explained the expression of "my frostie cares" in the notes; in the line "theis silver curles, theis emblems of my frostie cares"<sup>6)</sup> the meaning of frostie emblems i.e. curles, is transferred to cares, so the meaning is: the cares that have rendered my hair white; I have mentioned parallels of this use of frosty from *Henry VI*, where "this frosty head" occurs and from *Titus Andronicus*. I wonder what sense Dr. Barnouw attaches to "ijzigkoude zorg". The translation of "at Barnavelts Arraignment"<sup>7)</sup> by "tot Barnavelts bezwaring" is incorrect. The Arraignment is the trial, also used in this way in the pamphlet: *The Arraignment of Olden Barnavelts*. It is clear that the Prince is here referring to Barnavelts trial, for on that occasion Modesbargen accuses Barnavelts of conspiracy, cf. Act IV, sc. 5, where Modesbargen is brought in only for this purpose. I suggest the translation: "bij Barnavelts berechting". "Now for the Daunce, Boyes"<sup>8)</sup> is translated by "nou naar den dans!" Dr. Barnouw has misunderstood the stage directions. The burghers come to decorate the house; they sing a song and then they dance for Barnavelts wife. The stage-directions are: "Song", then "Daunce" and after the words spoken by Barnavelts wife "I thanck you frend", "Exeunt". So the meaning is not "nou naar den dans", but: "nou de dans". Dr. Barnouw prints: "Burgers dansend af", which is a deviation from the stage directions in the manuscript. I have attached a different meaning to the words "a little stay me".<sup>9)</sup> Dr. Barnouw translates: "steun me een weinig", I have explained the meaning

<sup>1)</sup> Act I, sc. 1, l. 162.

<sup>2)</sup> Act II, sc. 1, l. 610.

<sup>3)</sup> Act II, sc. 2, l. 808.

<sup>4)</sup> Modern Language Review, June 1923.

<sup>5)</sup> Act II, sc. 4.

<sup>6)</sup> Act III, sc. 1, l. 1068.

<sup>7)</sup> Act IV, sc. 4, l. 2111.

<sup>8)</sup> Act IV, sc. 4, l. 2151.

<sup>9)</sup> Act V, sc. 3, l. 2990.



of to stay by "to detain", Barnavelt means to say "suffer me to remain a little", as he wants to finish his speech before the executioner strikes the blow. I have given parallels of this use in the notes. Sometimes, when the text is obscure, the translation is not very elucidating; in my notes I have given the explanation of the lines 74-78; the lines in Dutch must seem obscure to readers who do not know the original; they run: "Barneveldt zint op nieuwe middelen om zich naam te maken? Of houdt het leven 'n maand of twee om vellen wat veertig jaren van gedegen dienst in keteligste zaken van den staat oprichtten 't zijner heugnis?" I do not like ambiguous expressions like "uw eerste stap omhoog" for "next". I should prefer "uw naaste stap", because Barnavelt's first step had been taken forty years ago. It sometimes occurs that, though the sense is correct, the words sound questionable to Dutch ears: for example the line "zoo'n dienaar vinden ze niet opgeraapt". Did Dr. Barnouw think of the not very dignified expression "vindt men niet opgeschept"? and "loop ten Grave" meaning "naar den Graaf"; it may be meant humorously, but it sounds funny to me.

But for these minor faults the translation is undoubtedly very careful, and Dr. Barnouw has succeeded in retaining the old colour of the play by rendering some expressions by Dutch equivalents of that age, as for example, "verdoord", "jonst" and "jonnen", "gij vergetelen", "onbescheid", etc. But I fear that the average reader may sometimes be in perplexity what to make of some words, as for example, in the lines: *de vier die achterbleven hielpe' askaks een boerekar met hooi over de brug*".

I think Dr. Barnouw has succeeded in bringing out the difference between Massinger's and Fletcher's oratorical style of which I have spoken in my introduction.<sup>1)</sup> On the whole Dr. Barnouw is happiest in the translation of the scenes, where Massinger displays his oratorical talents; he has caught with remarkable spirit the stately and dignified tone of the rhetorical passages; I mention as examples Act I sc. 1 and Act IV sc. 5, which deserve unreserved appreciation.

Amsterdam.

W. P. FRIJLINCK.

---

*Elizabethan Drama.* By JANET SPENS, M.A. D. Litt. Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, 1922. 5/— net.

This book professes to be "a manual intended for the use of university-students beginning to work at the subject". In order to estimate the value of such a work, then, we are to view it from the student's angle. And what may we expect as the special qualifications required in such a guide? First of all a clear statement as to how the student is to tackle this thorny subject. Dr. Spens wants him to study all the plays constituting "the whole of the Shakespeare canon; notes and introductions are at this stage unimportant." But how, I should like to know, are beginners to master Shakespeare's plays without any explanatory, critical and historical apparatus? But, remarkably enough, for the date of composition (and is this at this stage so much more important than contents?), Dr. Spens enumerates the most wonderfully incongruent collection of books for the student to go through. In the same breath, she recommends Dowden's *Shakespeare Primer*, and Ward's *English Dramatic Literature* — if accessible (sic!) and further on such a trifle as: Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, any Biographical Dictionary for the other plays,

---

<sup>1)</sup> pages LXXIX and LXXX.

Introductions to the Mermaid Series, the Stationer's Register, extant contemporary copies of the plays, Henslowe's Diary, the Records of the Revels-Office, extracts of the Corporation of London's Records published by the Malone Society and the Index compiled by Overall, the Bibliographical controversy with which are connected the names of Sir Sidney Lee, Prof. Pollard and Mr. Greg. What next! — the poor student may well exclaim.

If these are to be consulted merely to ascertain dates of composition, certainly not of vital importance to beginners, we may expect a copious bibliography, when it comes to textual, historical and topical difficulties. However, not a single title, not even such a scholarly and yet simple introduction as Dr. Boas's *Shakespeare and his Predecessors* is found worthy of a place here, let alone the long, glorious list of great critics, historians and interpreters of Elizabethan Drama. The order of the chapters is not very logical either. It would have been a better plan to prefix the chapter on Origins to that on Characteristics. And if Ben Jonson comes in for a 9-page treatment, should not a special chapter have been devoted to Shakespeare (even though many suggestive remarks are scattered throughout the book)? Is it wise to burden beginners with quite a number of new theories, such as that on *Troilus and Cressida* (see on this head Sir Sidney Lee's *Shakespeare*), or on *Pericles*, or on Shakespeare's supposed debt to Munday's *Zelauto* for *The Merchant of Venice*, and for *As you like it* to a Robin Hood play by the same? Again: if in the chapter on Origins a few good pages could be given to the cycle-plays, why should no more than 5 or 6 lines be assigned to the Moral and the Interlude? In the paragraph on comedy the *Secunda Pastorum* and *Gammer Gurton's Needle* (by the way: is the needle discovered when Hodge attempts to sit down, as Dr. Spens has it or when Diccon slaps him, as in Manly's edition?) are duly mentioned, yet *Ralph Royster Doyster* fails!

Does the writer consider her statement on page 36 to the effect "that Folk-drama was the chief factor in the development of English Drama", sufficiently supported by the very vague proposition that "it seems unlikely that drama of Church-origin should show so very little trace of classical influence"?

Occasionally, perhaps owing to careless revision, the style is far from clear, as e.g. on page 54: "In Peele's work (*The Old Wives' Tale*) as later in Beaumont and Fletcher's imitation of it *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* the simple folk who are very much alike, are kept outside the Dream frame work". Is there such a thing as a Dream-frame in *The Knight*?

The title of *Twelfth Night* proclaims its connexion with All Fools' Day, it says on page 85. The writer probably means the Feast of Fools. And if it is true that there is a "connexion of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* with the High Summer feast called May Day", how then does Dr. Spens explain the title? — From page 187 one might come to the conclusion that Middleton borrowed from Massinger, where it says: "*A Trick to catch the Old 'Un* has much resemblance to Massinger's *New Way to Pay Old Debts*, while his *Witch* has some links with *Macbeth*". Two lines lower down Dr. Spens is inclined to believe that he gave the hint to Massinger, which is indeed the right view, Middleton's play being the earlier of the two. — The chapter on The Apocrypha and Munday (Tucker Brooke's work is not mentioned) assigns the romantic plays in inferior forms to the years 1584—1593 and to Munday a co-operation with Shakespeare in dramatizing festival games. — The later chapters, namely those on The Contemporaries, The Successors and The Decadents, though giving rise to some more objections, are better suited for the purpose with which they have been written.

On the whole this manual does not seem to me to deserve much recommendation; though containing good hints, it bristles with too many "probable's" and "possible's" and can certainly not be placed on a line with the above-mentioned book by Dr. Boas or Wynne's *The Growth of English Drama*.

W. A. OVAA.

---

*Shelley and the Unromantics*. By OLWEN WARD CAMPBELL.  
Methuen, 1924. 16 sh.

This book has been hailed by many critics as one of the best ever written about Shelley. I cordially agree. The authoress possesses all the attributes of a good critic. The soundness of her judgment, her extensive and accurate knowledge, and the ease with which she brings herself into sympathy with her subject, seeing and feeling things as he saw and felt them, form a delightful combination, rarely met with, and raise her study to the plane of a standard work.

At the same time she puts every bit of her own personality into her writing, with all the advantages and drawbacks belonging to that method. The main advantage is that her book is singularly alive, it contains not a dull line and proves, if proof were needed, that it is not necessary for a biographer to creep into the novelist's skin *à la* M. Maurois, to secure for his work the interest of fiction. The drawback is that strongly and, on occasion, violently expressed personal opinions, make one feel disposed to quarrel with the author on minor points and temporarily to lose sight of her main argument.

The book is constructed on the following lines. First comes a chapter discussing the current view of Shelley's poetry held by ordinary readers. Then his biographers and friends are dealt with — Trelawney, Hunt, Byron, Medwin, Peacock, Hogg, Godwin and Mary. The next hundred odd pages are devoted to his life. After that, *Alastor*, *Prometheus Unbound* and the lyrics come in for special analysis. A chapter on the Romantic revival and another on Shelley's philosophy of life and poetry bring the book to a close.

The chief merit of *Shelley and the Unromantics* is the writer's successful attempt, after having armed herself with all the available material, to destroy once for all the unsympathetic and scornful belittlement of the man and his poetry by the cynical, and the futile and uncritical adulation of both by the sentimental. She shows that we need not look upon Shelley as a strange, eccentric and unearthly being, apart from the ordinary run of mankind in almost everything, in order to attain to a sincere and true appreciation. On the contrary, we may judge his life and his work by the same standards that are applied to other writers, without risking any loss of enjoyment to be had from his poetry, or of sympathy to be felt for the poet.

In the course of this process many blows have to be dealt, and Mrs. Campbell is by no means afraid of dealing them. They fall thickest in the notes, and there, it must be said, they are often very ungraciously delivered. Of Buxton Forman, who has a strong claim on the gratitude of all Shelley students, it is said that "his editing consists of a vulgar and irrelevant introduction, and a few uninformative notes" (p. 18). The author of one of the most valuable editions of *Prometheus Unbound* that I know, is contemptuously referred to as "one Miss Scudder" (p. 211). Professor Santayana wrote in *Winds of Doctrine* this statement: "Now . . . if Shelley had had



time to read Spinoza — an author with whom he would have found himself largely in sympathy — he might have learned . . ." etc., for which he is thus taken to task by Mrs. Campbell: "Now if Professor Santayana had had time to study his subject, he might have learned that Shelley read Spinoza, mentioned Spinoza in his letters, began to translate Spinoza, and planned to write a life of Spinoza."

This petulance is unfortunately not restricted to Mrs. Campbell's brothers and sisters of the critical craft, but is also extended to her dealings with figures in literature whose standing might have given the authoress pause to reflect. Surely no amount of distaste for Browning's poetry justifies the writer of a serious work on literature to say — "the poetical philosophy of Shelley was eventually *dismembered* and *disfigured* both in matter and manner, and served up in the hotch-potch of Browning" (p. 274). And, even while agreeing with the sentiment, one can hardly defend the wording of "What is slushy in Shelley can be even slushier in Tennyson" (p. 515). It is curious that, when this irritable mood takes hold of Mrs. Campbell, her diction suffers noticeably and perilously approaches vulgarity. For what other word can be applied to a passage where the authoress finds fault with a poetical conceit of Shelley in *Prometheus Unbound*, which leads her to write: "But who could have stamped 'O Follow, Follow' on the petals of an almond-tree, and on the sides of a mountain (even in a dream) except an American Advertising Agency?" (p. 215.) Or again: "he (Shelley) was only too prone to resemble a prohibitionist who should believe no song in the world equal to 'Drink to me only with thine eyes'" (p. 115). These instances of ponderous humour do, indeed, show the authoress to be on this, as on many other points, *en rapport* with the subject of her study, but that is no justification for their occurrence!

In dealing with Mrs. Campbell's manner it may also be pointed out that she suffers occasionally from an inclination to score a point by smartness of expression, even at the expense of correctness of statement. To this inclination must be attributed the sweeping statement on p. 30: "In Shelley's life and all its errors, we see a man struggling desperately to express and realise his ideas; in Byron's we see the disintegration of a man who has practically none." Far more frequently, however, the author's felicity of diction adds to the value of her book by throwing a new and strong light on some point that 'oft was thought but ne'er so well expressed.' Thus it is said of Byron, "When he fell in love with Mary Chaworth it was unfortunately not the first occasion; he had fallen in love once for all before that — with himself" (p. 30). Scarcely less happy is the description of the Boinville family, "theirs was a society of that mixed effusiveness and culture, generosity and gush, which has its place in the world and its charm; but to Peacock it was merely a subject for satire" (p. 120). Godwin's attitude towards Shelley, both rude and covetous, is delightfully visualised in the words "with one fist doubled and the other palm extended." (p. 136).

On the whole the book is well written. But here and there the sentences halt badly. On p. 103 we read: "In 1812, as the world he was struggling with cared only for the labels on its public institutions, nothing for their true significance, he had fallen into the error of seeing these not as they had been or might be, but as his age had branded them." This is bad enough and "The spirit in which of old he had rejoiced in the ultimate prospect of Jupiter's ruin" (p. 208) is even worse. A delicate ear for rhythm does not seem to be one of the authoress's chief accomplishments. Therefore

one need not attach much importance to her statement that "the metre of *The Sensitive Plant* is often most uncomfortably jerky" (p. 239, note). And I, for one, am certainly not prepared to follow Mrs. Campbell's suggestion and read 'far' as a dissyllabic word in the line from *The Aziola*:

Unlike and far sweeter than them all. (p. 242.)

The portraits of all the male characters that played a part in Shelley's life are drawn with wonderful vivacity and accuracy. I am less sure about those of the women. With them the writer seems to be less in sympathy. "If Shelley had lived," says Mrs. Campbell, "Mary would not have been happy. We can only imagine her contented in the part she would have filled so well — of a brilliant society lady, much admired, and of great service to all about her, rarely alone, and never forced to be too deeply moved." (p. 66). I think that many readers can imagine quite a different picture of Mary, but none of all these imaginings, so long as they are no more, matter very much either way. About Harriet we are informed that "there is something uncanny about her, and letters and descriptions leave one with the impression that she was almost totally devoid of heart." Here, again, there seems to be some discrepancy between the strength of the language and that of the evidence on which it rests.

In the biographical part it appears again and again how deeply Mrs. Campbell has probed the soul of the poet, and how valuable, therefore, her interpretation of his character is. She very rightly emphasizes its strength. "Shelley, with all these fevers of the spirit — his discontent, impatience, and variableness; his rash impulses, sensitiveness, and melancholy — was a strong man. It is a fact frequently overlooked. He has been so tricked up in the frills and fur-belowes of sentimental scribblers, so bedarlinged with epithets of 'Eternal child', of dabbler in rainbows, of 'nursling of the womb, like a bee or a butterfly,' that many people think of him as a writer of enchanting lyrics, who was, in other respects, at best, one of God's own fools." (p. 184). With strong approval I also quote: "*Alastor* was not the outcome of any disillusionment in Shelley's life with Mary: neither was it due to any feeling that Mary had saved him from an endless search after the ideal. Quite the contrary: his reawakened sense of beauty had intensified within him that yearning for love and beauty which is the crown of thorns of all men of poetic genius" (p. 191). Admirable, too, are the words on Shelley's paradises: "These creations of Shelley's are not the result of aloofness from life. He lived whole-heartedly, and gave the whole of himself equally to his poetry or his friends. He did not numb his sorrows by these visionary states of bliss, as some of his generation numbed theirs by opium, or cynicism, or metaphysics. They had the contrary effect — they kept him always alive to a sense of disappointment. They are the efforts of a spirit penetrated with the beauty and sorrow of life to reach out into the Future and Unknown after hope and faith." (p. 293-4.)

The analyses of *Alastor*, *Prometheus Unbound*, and the lyrics are rich in good things. I am very grateful to Mrs. Campbell for having called attention to the magnificence of the first line of the *Cenci*, and am almost prepared to overlook for that reason her flagrantly unjust criticism of the "much-praised ending", where the authoress's want of sympathy with Shelley's women seems to extend to his heroines. (p. 239.) When Mrs. Campbell calls Keats "more thoroughly an artist than Shelley," (p. 226) because he liked best to round off his poems, or at least to glide gently down to earth again from his great heights," (*La Belle Dame Sans Merci* and the *Ode to*

a *Nightingale* are quoted as instances) whereas to Shelley the end was everything, and the end must aspire, the conclusion of a poem being with him nearly always lifted into a higher and ever higher plane (cf. the ending of *Adonais*), I find myself in strong disagreement with her argument, though not with her conclusion. Most illuminating is the writer's comment on Shelley's metaphors: "Shelley's metaphors and similes are often found bewildering, but the fault is not really his; the difficulty, if anywhere, is in his subjects. When he says to the Spirit of Intellectual Beauty:

Thou that to human thought art nourishment  
Like darkness to a dying flame!

he is not idly poetizing. To him the image is perfectly clear, and expresses what he himself experienced when he descended into the calm vast darkness of the soul's dim meditation to bring forth a little spark of thought. He gives the further and contrasting development, when the spark becomes a great fire, in the *Skylark*:

Like a poet hidden  
In the light of thought.

His poetry becomes much less obscure when it is once realized that for him thought, emotions, dreams, the whole realm of the spirit, were as definite — as concrete — as the flames and stars with which he compares them." (p. 227.)

The chapter on the Romantic Revival and its effects is a curious illustration of the dangers involved in the rigorous development of a pre-conceived notion. One would have thought that the complexity of Romanticism had by this time become sufficiently recognised to deter anyone from the attempt at giving a new definition in defiance of the old. Isolated utterances of Coleridge and Keats are not good enough to invalidate "wonder" and "the return to Nature" as elements in the Romantic Movement. When, instead of being content to add one to the acknowledged component parts of this intricate literary phenomenon, Mrs. Campbell wants to set up "faith in man", and "the sense of the inherent greatness of his soul" as its chief characteristic, we need not be surprised that to her Wordsworth, Keats and Shelley represent the real Romantic movement. To find Christ called the first and the greatest of the Romantics, and the League of Nations placed at the other extremity, need cause no alarm either, for this is quite in accordance with the theory which the authoress develops, and develops ingeniously. Only — the path that Mrs. Campbell has cut out is too straight and narrow to be romantic. It cannot compete in attractiveness with the wide fields, washed by many a pleasant little rill, which her predecessors have jointly laid out.

"Shelley is the most tantalizing of poets", says the first sentence of this book. By the time the reader has finished it, the tantalization will have diminished considerably, thanks to Mrs. Campbell's labour of insight and of love.

London.

J. KOOISTRA.

---

*L'Oeuvre de Swinburne.* Par PAUL DE REUL, Professeur à l'Université de Bruxelles. Robert Sand, Brussels. 1922. - 30 francs.

There is nothing hurried or scamped in this important, if rather too laudatory, tribute to what for the want of a better name we may term



Swinburne's genius. It is the fullest study of the man and his work that has as yet appeared. And the fact that Prof. de Reul wrote for 'Latin' readers — whom it would apparently be a mistake to credit with an adequate knowledge of literary English — has made his self-imposed task all the more arduous. For it has induced him to supply prose-translations of all the passages he quotes. More than once, indeed, the attentive reader may catch himself preferring a French passage to its English original, since Swinburne, who certainly is a master of metre, is only occasionally the *melodious* poet that he is claimed (or cracked up) to be in handbooks and critiques.

Professor de Reul, too, devotes a long and enthusiastic chapter to Swinburne's 'music' — *Chapitre II: Musique et Poésie* — the first sentence of which runs: 'De la poésie anglaise, art national qui remplace un peu la musique, Swinburne est le musicien par excellence', though the author has been careful to append a note informing us that '*Comme d'autres poètes, il était peu doué pour la musique. M. Gosse parle de „son manque d'oreille”. On l'enthousiasmait par un air de music-hall*'. I hope to discuss the musical qualities of Swinburne's verse at some length in 'Neophilologus'. Suffice it to say here that there is no finding fault with de Reul's main position: '*L'art d'écrire est un duel dont les conditions varient dans chaque langue. Chacune a ses avantages et ses défauts, ses préférences et ses aversions, sa constitution spéciale, ses nécessités dont on fait des vertus*'. But I hesitate to endorse his theory regarding Swinburne's excessive preference for words like *wine* and *flower*. Unlike de Reul I would not attribute this to his love of full diphthongs, but to the fact that his precocious mind became fixed and rigid at a very early date. To us Northerners, whose brains take a long time to mature, and whose minds retain their plasticity for years and years — in Goethe's case to the very threshold of death — Swinburne must always remain something of a freak. As a schoolboy he was doubtless very suggestible, a striking instance of Byron's 'wax to receive and marble to retain', hence his stock rimes, his stock epithets, his handful of unchanging — or should I say 'crystallized'? — ideas, his undeveloping prosody. Upon his rimes — *light* and *night*, *breath* and *death*, etc. — there is no need to dwell here. As for his epithets; why does he so often label the sea as *sterile*? Is it for the sound? Surely the sound is poor, poorer than that of the synonymous *barren*. Pictorial value the word has none; 'barren' has. (Compare the 'Barren Grounds' in North America.) The explanation is furnished by the Homeric *κόλπους ἄλγος ἀπρυγέτω* (Od. V, 52), in which *ἀπρυγέτω* used to be interpreted as *harvestless*<sup>1)</sup>. Reading and translating in class must have furnished Swinburne with the word *sterile*, and behold him equipped for life. Had his Latin Grammar anything to do with his English prosody? The rule *vocalis ante vocalem corripitur* certainly had. Compare (my italics):

Then came in  
Three weaving women, and span each a thread,  
Saying This for strength and That for luck, and one  
Saying Till the brand upon the hearth burn down,  
So long shall this man see good days and live.

('Atalanta in Calydon' 243-246).

..... but those grey women with bound hair  
Who fright the gods frightened not him; he laughed  
Seeing them, and pushed out hands to feel and haul  
Distaff and thread .....

(id. 276-279).

<sup>1)</sup> Carel Vosmaer's metrical translation has: '*oogstontberende zeeplas*'. The interpretation is rejected by Van Leeuwen and other authorities.

Under deep apple-boughs  
 My lady hath her house;  
 She wears upon her brows  
 The flower thereof;  
*All saying* but what God saith  
 To her is as vain breath . . . .

(‘Madonna Mia’, Stanza X)

Some with *crying* and wailing, some with notes like sound of bells that toll,  
 Some with *sighing* and laughing, some with words that blessed and made us whole,  
 Passed, and left us, and we know not what they were, nor what were we.  
 Would we know, *being* mortal? Never breath of answering whisper stole  
 From the shore that hath no shore beyond it set in all the sea.

(‘On the Verge’ 16-20.)

Swinburne’s ideas — and the paucity thereof — have received full treatment on more than one occasion. De Reul makes no attempt to prove that their name is Legion. But he extenuates: ‘S’il n’eut pas „beaucoup d’idées”, il eut éminemment le culte, le respect de l’idée, l’aptitude platonicienne à la concevoir comme réelle: de là, chez ce poète artiste, le goût singulier de l’abstraction, la personnification constante de l’Amour, du Changement, de la Mort, du Destin, des Désirs, des Craintes, des Espoirs, particulièrement du Temps et de ses divisions, l’année, le mois, les saisons, la fin du printemps, la fin de l’enfance . . . . . Le sentiment de la nature vivante anime ces images du Temps’. Similar observations would apply to Shelley, and again the *fons et origo* would appear to be the school, literary tradition, Homer (with his Fear and Discord and Lust of Battle), rather than natural preference or conscious artistic striving. De Reul deplores the fact that ‘parfois Swinburne retombe aux entités, aux spectres à majuscules de l’ancienne rhétorique . . . .’ Let us, however, admit that he is incapable of the worst enormities in this respect, such as are furnished for instance by the Spanish Byron, Espronceda, whose *Himno de la Inmortalidad* ‘represents’ the ‘creative flame of the world’ as a ‘pure germ’, a ‘fecund principle’ with Death in chains at its — or her — feet!<sup>1)</sup> And I am happy to agree with John Drinkwater that the often impugned lines

Time, with a gift of tears  
 Grief, with a glass that ran

are absolutely right.

But I cannot possibly admit ‘la lucidité, la pureté grammaticale du poète, sa logique impeccable jusque dans l’inspiration débordante’. Compare the following stanza (the 12th) from the sixth canto of *The Tale of Balen*:

And Balen craved his name who rode  
 Beside him, where the wild wood glowed  
 With joy to feel how noontide flowed  
 Through glade and glen and rough green road  
 Till earth grew joyful as the sea . . . . .

The wild wood glowed with joy to feel noontide make the earth joyful. How joyful? As the sea. Is then the sea always joyful? To Swinburne it may have been. But to the wood? *The Tale of Balen*, to which we might fitly apply *Macbeth*, Act V, Sc V, lines 26-28, abounds with such passages.

My attitude is respectful but unconvinced when I read: ‘Enfin le sentiment de la nature, — corps à corps avec les vagues, bain de lumière, d’air et d’azur, — est chez Swinburne plus direct et plus instinctif que chez

<sup>1)</sup> Puro germen, principio fecundo  
 Que encadenas la muerte á tus piés.

aucun poète que nous connaissions,' — unless this *nous connaissions* stands for *je connaisse*. Of course it might be argued that the more intimate is a poet's communion with nature, the fewer will be his word-pictures, the vaguer will be his outlines. Clear and intense images presuppose a detached though interested spectator; they are incompatible with mystical intercourse or with the overpowering delight taken in mere physical contact. Where are the animals in Swinburne's world? Has he written any passages that will compare for 'physical impressionism' with Gibson's *Hare*?<sup>1)</sup>

'Twas just the minute when the snipe  
 As though clock-wakened, every jack,  
 An hour ere dawn, dart in and out  
 The mist-wreaths filling syke and slack,  
 And flutter wheeling round about,  
 And drumming out the Summer night.  
 I lay star-gazing yet a bit;  
 Then chilly-skinned, I sat upright  
 To shrug the shivers from my back;  
 And, drawing out a straw to suck,  
 My teeth nipped through it at a bite . . .  
 The liveliest lad is out of pluck  
 An hour ere dawn — a tame cock-sparrow —  
 When cold stars shiver through his marrow,  
 And wet mist soaks his mother-wit.  
 . . . . .  
 When from the corner of my eye,  
 Upon a heathery knowe hard by,  
 With long lugs cocked, and eyes astare,  
 Yet all serene, I saw a hare.

Upon my belly in the straw,  
 I lay, and watched her sleek her fur,  
 As daintily, with well-licked paw,  
 She washed her face and neck and ears:  
 Then, clean and comely in the sun,  
 She kicked her heels up, full for fun,  
 As if she did not care a pin  
 Though she should jump out of her skin . . .

Swinburne is 'tumultueux, emporté, rarement descriptif.' (p. 278). We may add that his lack of descriptive power proceeds from lack of vision, or rather from the pernicious habit of looking at nature through the spectacles of literature. He forgets the presence of the singing nightingale for thinking of Philomela.

We may be particularly thankful to Prof. de Reul for the charming (and instructive), chapter telling of his visit to 'The Pines', Putney. — In conclusion I must observe that John M. Synge, the Irish dramatist, died in 1909. Surely that was not 'depuis que ces lignes furent écrites'. (p. 413). And the author's metaphors on page 36: 'l'allitération . . . trame profonde, sur quoi se greffent mille nuances, comme l'onde se décompose en remous secondaires . . .' are rather strangely mixed.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

<sup>1)</sup> I mention Gibson here, because he is a Northumbrian, like Swinburne. De la Mare, Masfield, Hodgson, Davies, Bridges, might be cited too.



*The Rudiments of Criticism.* By E. A. GREENING LAMBORN,  
Head Master of the East Oxford School. — Oxford, Clarendon  
Press. 1921. — 3/6.

This book is intended to be put in the hands of teachers, who hold that literary training consists, not in imparting miscellaneous information — mainly historical and biographical, — but in getting one's pupils to take an interest in literature as such and to learn to distinguish between good poetry and bad.

The work is unequal and ill-digested, Chapter I — "What is Poetry?" — being the worst. Of course children, with their inherent propensity for taking things on trust, will be ready enough to swallow a statement like this: "All of us . . . see dimly, as a half-blind man sees a light, beauty in a hill or a cloud, or a primrose: but the poet (here we have that confounded definite article again! W. v. D.) sees it as a radiant glow that moves him to cry aloud with delight and so to make us also look again more earnestly to share his vision." This is not hitting the nail on the head. Lump all poets together, and you will get a terribly heterogeneous flock indeed, and for one who would cry out there would be nine who would not. Gushingness is characteristic of flappers and of bread-and-butter misses, but not of poets. 'But', it might be objected, 'this must not be taken literally. It means that a poet, in response to the world about him, finds himself in need of self-expression.' Well and good, but one poet will be left quite cold by what rouses another's enthusiasm, or aversion, or hate. And how to account for the fact that so many wretched men 'are cradled into poetry by wrong'? Is it because they perceive wrong to be beautiful? *A d'autres!* The beauty of a poem is a thing achieved, not a thing rendered.<sup>1)</sup>

But this same chapter contains an excellent exposition of the faults of a 'poem' like Eliza Cook's hysterical 'Arm-Chair'. And thus the book proceeds in a regular succession of exploded or mistaken notions and shrewd observations. I will give one more instance:

"Rime is the one beauty in words which was not revealed to the Greeks. Like Gothic architecture, it is a gift conceived in France and developed by the western nations under French leadership. It was meet that it should come into England with the law and organization of the Conqueror, for it is a natural source — as he was and his race — of order and organized form. It brought the stanza into being, as he the state and gave it definite shapes, as the mighty Norman hand formed lawless elements into the union of regular communities . . . ."

This sounds like Ruskin and is very debatable.

. . . "An ill-instructed genius like Walt Whitman may preach and practise an ignorant contempt for rime as 'a feudal superstition', and inartistic minds who read him only for the substance of his thoughts may believe him. But without rime and its restricting and shaping control only the very greatest have power to force verse into the mould of beauty; and without rhythm poetry soon degenerates into the chaos of anarchy . . . ."

This is carrying grist to the mill of the *verslibristes*, because they will very justly observe that it is only the very greatest literary artists they want, and that there are many rimesters they could do without.

Then, too, Mr. Lamborn is in bondage to the vagaries of English spelling, so that he hears alliterations where there are none and takes long vowels

<sup>1)</sup> According to Mr. G. L. the great poets are minute observers (p. 75). I wonder. Was Milton?

for short ones and *vice versa*. In the following lines from Tennyson's *Morte d'Arthur* he hears fifteen different vowel-sounds, 'and only five of them occur more than once, and then not in juxtaposition':

And leaping down the ridges lightly, plunged  
Among the bulrush beds, and clutched the sword  
And strongly wheeled and threw it . . . . .

Continental readers will prick up their ears on being told that the second vowel in *among* differs from the one in *plunged*, and that the unstressed vowels in *leaping*, *ridges*, and *lightly* are all different.

It is an amateurish piece of work, and is sure to pass through several editions.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

*Oscar Wilde, His Life and Confessions.* By FRANK HARRIS.  
2 volumes. Printed and published by the author. 29 Waverley  
Place, New York, 1920. \$ 5.00 each.

In the introduction to this important work the author explains why he hesitated a long time before he decided to publish it. Some English friends tried to dissuade him for various reasons, but the principal cause of the delay was the expectation that some one else would write about Wilde in a spirit which he could approve; but since nothing of the kind appeared, he felt at last bound to do the work himself. And he has given us a book so interesting that we cannot but be thankful, that in the ten years he waited no one turned up to undertake the difficult and delicate task.

Frank Harris possesses all the qualifications for it. For a long period he was one of Wilde's best friends, he is himself a writer of reputation, his 'Contemporary Portraits' i. a. being one of the finest and most original collections of short biographies of the times, he is personally acquainted with many eminent men who knew Wilde and he is ruthlessly frank and impartial. One proof of this last quality so desirable for a biographer is that he does not hesitate to show the good points in his own conduct and personality whenever this may be conducive to a better appreciation of the facts, a courage more commendable in this case than any conventional scrupulous modesty.

The tragic narrative is written with great dramatic intensity and psychological insight. From the first chapter, which relates an episode in the life of Oscar Wilde's parents, it captivates the attention and the interest does not for a moment wane. The book would have great value as a 'document humain' even if the principal actor in the tragedy had not at the same time been a great figure in literature. And although it reveals a genuine affection for Wilde and throws new light on some amiable points in his character, his faults are by no means condoned or kept in the shade; he is shown us indeed, especially after the release from prison, as a man with some very annoying qualities, which must have rendered it difficult for any friend to remain loyal to him.

The book bears the stamp of absolute sincerity throughout. But of course even such sincerity does not always necessarily involve objective truth and after Harris' masterly exposition we still feel some doubt on one point: whether Lord Alfred Douglas has not been blamed too much. The author is very hard on him. Possibly with reason; we dare not decide. We only

remember, that Douglas has also had his defenders, that even André Gide has some kind words for him and that during his lawsuit versus Ransome it appeared that Douglas and his relatives had repeatedly assisted Wilde financially, whereas Harris — chiefly on the authority of Wilde himself, which to say the least of it was always a little doubtful — states that such help had been ludicrously inadequate, that on the contrary Oscar Wilde had in the time of his success advanced much greater sums to his friend than he ever received in return. It must be confessed, however, that the documents and the testimony of trustworthy persons, published by Frank Harris in this book, make a strong case against Alfred Douglas.

Robert Ross, Wilde's friend and literary executor, whose critical comments on some points of the narrative are added in an appendix, says that Mr. Harris' book will be 'the classic biography' and G. B. Shaw, who contributes some interesting personal Memories calls it: 'the best life of Wilde'. This evidence from men so eminently fit to judge may safely be considered conclusive.

Among the many addenda there is one of special interest: the main part of the unpublished portion of *De Profundis*. The volumes contain five portraits and a facsimile of Wilde's handwriting.

A. G. v. K.

### Brief Mention.

*The Year's Work in English Studies, 1922.* Edited for the English Association by SIR SIDNEY LEE and F. S. BOAS. Pp. 220. Milford, 1923. 7/6 net.

English scholars are displaying considerable activity in the useful but difficult labour of bibliography. Almost simultaneously the Modern Humanities Research Association and the English Association began to undertake, some four years ago, the compilation of annual volumes surveying the year's work in English Studies at home and abroad. Each performs its self-set task in its own way, and the two publications supplement each other. The *Bibliography* of the M. H. R. A. is a classified list of items, contributed by correspondents in various countries; it aims at being exhaustive. *The Year's Work*, on the other hand, is a 'descriptive and critical record', in which only the most important books and articles are dealt with by a committee of English scholars, each of whom is responsible for the section entrusted to his care. It reads like a collection of reviews and brief mentions.

It is obviously hard to test the whole of a work like this. A remark on the amount of Dutch work represented in it may not be inappropriate. In the indexes to the volumes for 1920 and 1921 not a single Dutch name occurs. In the index to the 1922 volume as many as two Dutch writers are mentioned: Miss Frijlinck (*The Tragedy of Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*) and Mr. W. Kloos (*Shelley in Nederland*, *Nieuwe Gids*, Sept. 1922); besides, the articles published in *English Studies* by Miss Serjeantson and Fräul. Kawa are duly referred to. We hope it is not overweening pride that prompts the suggestion that during the years 1920—1922 more work was done by Dutch scholars that might have been found worthy of inclusion. The same neglect of Dutch work is evident in the list of books and articles at the end of each number of the *Modern Language Review*. In the case of *The Year's Work*, at any rate, the fault may partly lie with the Dutch authors, many of whom seem loth to part with a copy or offprint of their work for bibliographical purposes, as the correspondent for Holland of the *Bibliography* of the M. H. R. A. knows by experience. It may, therefore, be opportune to transcribe here the conclusion of the Preface to *The Year's Work*: "It will be helpful if publishers in Great Britain and on the Continent will forward copies of books and periodicals as soon as they appear (with prices) to the Secretary of The English Association (4 Buckingham Gate, London, S. W.)". — Z.

**The Bibliography has to be held over to the next number.**



# John Masfield, Poet.

## Some Reflections.

### I.

'Of making many books there is no end.' And of the writing of critiques there is no end either. The fact many occasionally fill a critic's mind with misgivings, and he may fall to wondering which is the happier warrior, the author, who fondly imagines he is writing for eternity, or the critic, who never harbours any such illusion; and whether, since both of them allow their lights to shine before men, it is not an impertinence that the lesser light should take upon itself to pronounce judgment on the greater.

The answer is that the critic's work, provided it is genuine and conscientious, is just as lasting as the author's, because it is just as creative. Surely he is to be considered a creator of sorts, who helps time and humanity to build a Palace of Art with the material furnished by artists, and who does this, testing cautiously, accepting comparatively much, rejecting more.

A poet, whatever may have been his prototype, is not a *shaman* any more than a sculptor, a painter, a musician, an architect are shamans. They are all artists. And poetry is an art, the practice of which implies constant experimenting, with an occasional, hardly hoped for success, and with many a failure. How a failure, so far from disheartening a poet, may act as a spur or a whip, urging him on to further efforts, concerns himself. The failure as such is the concern of the critic.

### II.

In Masfield's case another kind of failure may be pointed out first of all, viz. a failure to stick to an announced programme. This is the programme prefixed to his first poetical volume, 'Salt-Water Ballads' (1902):

Not the be-medalled Commander, beloved of the throne,  
Riding cock-horse to parade when the bugles are blown,  
But the lads who carried the koppie, and cannot be known.

Not the ruler for me, but the ranker, the tramp of the road,  
The slave with the sack on his shoulders pricked on with the goad,  
The man with too weighty a burden, too weary a load.

The sailor, the stoker of steamers, the man with the clout,  
The chantyman bent at the halliards putting a tune to the shout,  
The drowsy man at the wheel and the tired look-out.

. . . . .  
Of the maimed, of the halt and the blind in the rain and the cold —  
Of these shall my songs be fashioned, my tales be told.

And to this programme Masfield appended an AMEN in capitals. But from the outset he has been unable to remain faithful to it. In his very first volume we see a juxtaposition — sometimes a mutual jostling — of romance and reality, arraignments of the present followed by flights into a gorgeous past, and after being a spokesman and advocate for the down-trodden he feels he has earned a reward, oh, a quite unobjectionable reward,

and regales himself with fancies and recollections of *Tewkesbury Road* and of the west wind in the West Country, 'the land where he belongs'. It is true, when Herefordshire has got her roving son back again, it is not long before he tires of his mother, and he tells her plainly that he is going 'to a windy tossing anchorage where yawls and ketches ride', and that he wants to hear

'the sea-wind, the mewing of the gulls,  
The clucking, sucking of the sea about the rusty hulls,  
The songs at the capstan . . . . .'

'Men are the merest Ixions', as Robert Browning has it in 'The Glove'.

### III.

'Ballads' (1903) presents the same features, though differently apportioned. 'Realism' preponderates in the earlier volume, but romanticism in this. Sometimes realism has its revenge, for instance when love of adventure sends the author to the Mexican Gulf only to confront him with the sordidness of 'Spanish Port' . . . .

The town begins on the sea-beaches,  
And the town's mad with the stinging flies,  
The drinking water's mostly leeches,  
It's a far remove from Paradise  
Is Spanish Port,  
Fever port . . . .

Once or twice on the other hand Masfield's realistic vision helps him to intensify the symbolism of a poem, as in 'The Ballad of Sir Bors':

My horse is spavined and ribbed, and his bones come through his hide,  
My sword is rotten with rust, but I shake the reins and ride . . . .  
It will happen at last, at dusk, as my horse limps down the fell  
A star will glow like a note God strikes on a silver bell . . . .

And in 'Posted as Missing' — i. e. at Lloyd's, in the 'Graveyard' — the drop from fancy into reality does not fail of its effect:

Under all her topsails she trembled like a stag,  
The wind made a ripple in her bonny red flag;  
They cheered her from the shore and they cheered her from the pier,  
And under all her topsails she trembled like a deer.

So she passed swaying, where the green seas run,  
Her wind-steadied topsails were stately in the sun;  
There was glitter on the water from her red port light,  
So she passed swaying, till she was out of sight.

Long and long ago it was, a weary time it is,  
The bones of her sailor-men are coral plants by this:  
Coral plants, and shark-weed, and a mermaid's comb,  
And if the fishers net them they never bring them home.

*It's rough on sailors' women. They have to mangle hard  
And stitch at dungarees till their finger-ends are scarred . . .*

(My italics).

It must be added that this poem did not occur in the edition of 1903, being for the first time included in the enlarged reissue of 1910, entitled 'Ballads and Poems', which also contained four poems — [*D'Avalos*] *Prayer*, *Sorrow of Mydath*, *Tewkesbury Road* and *Sea Fever* — from 'Salt-Water

Ballads', which Masfield at that time refused to have reprinted. It is significant that the four are entirely innocent of any intention to stand up for rankers, stokers or 'men with the clout'.

## IV.

It is fairly easy to state what authors stood by the cradle of the new-born poet. In 'Salt-Water Ballads' Kipling's influence predominates as regards diction and versification, and manifests itself in the 'thump' at the end of a line and an affectation of cynicism when characters are introduced speaking:

"Soggy she grew, 'n' she didn't lift, 'n' she listed more 'n' more,  
Till her bell struck 'n' her boiler-pipes began to wheeze 'n' snore;  
She settled, settled, listed, heeled, 'n' then may I be cust,  
If her sneezin', wheezin' boiler-pipes did not begin to bust!

"'N' then the stars began to shine, 'n' the birds began to sing,  
'N' the next I knowed I was bandaged up 'n' my arm were in a sling,  
'N' a swab in uniform were there, 'n' 'Well', says he; 'n' how  
Are yer arms, 'n' legs, 'n' liver, 'n' lungs, 'n' bones a-feelin now?"

"Where am I?" says I, 'n' he says, says he, a-cantin' to the roll,  
'You're aboard the R. M. S. *Marie* in the after Glory-Hole,  
'N' you've had a shave, if you wish to know, from the port o' Kingdom Come.  
Drink this', he says, 'n' I takes 'n' drinks, 'n' s'elp me it was rum!

"That's the end o' the yarn . . . . .  
"Them's the works o' the Lord you sees in steam 'n' sailin' ships,  
Rocks 'n' shatterin' seas 'n' breakers right ahead,  
'N' works o' nights 'n' work o' days enough to strike you dead."

But there is one poem in the volume which is pure Housman and Shropshire Lad; it is entitled 'On Malvern Hill':

A wind is brushing down the clover,  
It sweeps the tossing branches bare,  
Blowing the poising kestrel over  
The crumbling ramparts of the Caer.

It whirls the scattered leaves before us  
Along the dusty road to home,  
Once it awakened into chorus  
The heart-strings in the ranks of Rome.

There by the gusty coppice border  
The shrilling trumpets broke the halt,  
The Roman line, the Roman order,  
Swayed forwards to the blind assault.

The leaves whirl in the wind's riot  
Beneath the Beacon's jutting spur,  
Quiet are clan and chief, and quiet  
Centurion and signifer.

With which compare:

On Wenlock Edge the wood's in trouble;  
His forest fleece the Wrekin heaves;  
The gale, it plies the saplings double,  
And thick on Severn snow the leaves.

'T would blow like this through holt and hanger  
When Uricon the city stood:  
'T is the old wind in the old anger,  
But then it threshed another wood.



Then, 't was before my time, the Roman  
 At yonder heaving hill would stare:  
 The blood that warms an English yeoman,  
 The thoughts that hurt him, they were there.

The gale, it plies the saplings double,  
 It blows so hard, 't will soon be gone:  
 To-day the Roman and his trouble  
 Are ashes under Uricon.

(‘A Shropshire Lad’ XXXI).

Though the resemblance is too striking to be fortuitous, it need not on that account be considered intentional any more than a certain number of Yeatsian echoes in Masfield’s work are intentional.<sup>1)</sup> Occasionally indeed the intention is so plain as to invite comparison. The messenger, for instance, who has come to announce to King Philip the Second the disaster of the Invincible Armada (pp. 357-359 Coll. Ed.) speaks in Michael Drayton’s vein, using Drayton’s Agincourt stanza (‘Fair stood the wind for France’) — without quite reaching Drayton’s level:

The wind and sea were fair,  
 We lay at anchor there;  
 The stars burned in the air,  
 The men were sleeping,  
 When in the midnight dark  
 Our watchman saw a spark  
 Suddenly light a bark  
 With long flames leaping.

Then, as they stood amazed,  
 Others and others blazed;  
 Then terror set them crazed,  
 They ran down screaming:  
 “Fire-ships are coming! Wake [!]  
 Cast loose, for Jesus’ sake!  
 Eight fire-ships come from Drake —  
 Look at their gleaming!”<sup>2)</sup>

Nobly the English line  
 Trampled the bubbled brine;  
 We heard the gun-trucks whine  
 To the taut laniard.  
 Onwards we saw them forge,  
 White billowing at the gorge.  
 “On, on!” they cried, “St. George!  
 Down with the Spaniard!”<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Compare swing and diction of the following lines from ‘Philip the King’ (1914):

Philip, Philip, Philip!  
 The evil men do has strength,  
 It gathers behind the veils  
 While the unjust thing prevails,  
 While the pride of life is strong.  
 But the balance tips at length,  
 And the unjust things are tales,  
 The pride of life is a song.

<sup>2)</sup> The last line of this stanza contains an annoying anti-climax owing to the weakness of that infelicitous word *gleaming*.

<sup>3)</sup> After the first six lines, which are good and impressionistic, the seventh and eighth come as a mere tag. Spanish sailors might — and would — have heard confused shouts from the oncoming English ships, but they could never have picked out words like ‘St. George’.

Then again, Masfield's sonnets — some of them to be found in 'Poems and Ballads' but the vast majority in 'Lollingdon Downs' — are Shakespearean. Compare

## (LIII)

You are more beautiful than women are,  
 Wiser than men, stronger than ribbed death,  
 Juster than Time, more constant than the stars,  
 Dearer than love, more intimate than breath,  
 Having all art, all science, all control  
 Over the still unsmithied, even as Time  
 Cradles the generations of man's soul.  
 You are the light to guide, the way to climb.  
 So, having followed beauty, having bowed  
 To wisdom and to death, to law, to power,  
 I like a blind man stumble from the crowd  
 Into the darkness of a deeper hour,  
 Where in the lonely silence I may wait  
 The prayed-for gleam — your hand upon the gate.  
 (Coll. Ed. p. 437).

How as a writer of long narrative poems Masfield has been influenced by the great story-teller Chaucer, it is superfluous to point out, and the ease with which one can trace all these indebtednesses (to use a Carlylese plural) is accounted for by the fact that as a man of letters Masfield — apart from what he must have picked up from friends like J. M. Synge — is self-taught. It is matter of common knowledge how he was bred for the sea, for a career in the English merchant service, and how he ran away and became a potboy in a New York *saloon*, years ago when there were saloons in the States and when there were American drinks to be had in the same.<sup>1)</sup> (On this subject compare Masfield's little prose volume *A Mainsail Haul*.) But it is not known over how many years his nautical career extended, and we are entirely in ignorance about the duration of his 'travels'. A few sceptical people, indeed, have always wondered whether he can have really seen and trodden all the foreign parts that loom so large in his writings, — even when he is professedly reminiscent. Certain it is that his knowledge of Spanish is self-acquired; the mere fact that in 'Philip the King' he calls one of the Castilian officers *Don Alarcon* — which is as wrong as 'Sir Scott' would be instead of *Sir Walter* — would suffice to prove this. I also suppose that in his metrical versions from the Spanish, which are creditable enough, he has refrained from imitating the Spanish system of *assonances* simply because he was not aware of its existence. Compare the following stanzas by Bécquer (the 'Collected Edition' puts the accent on the wrong syllable) with Masfield's rendering of them:

Cerraron sus ojos  
 Que aun tenía abiertos;  
 Taparon su cara  
 Con un blanco lienzo;  
 Y unos sollozando,  
 Otros en silencio,  
 De la triste alcoba  
 Todos se salieron.

They closed her eyes,  
 They were still open;  
 They hid her face  
 With a white linen,  
 And some sobbing,  
 Others in silence,  
 From the sad bedroom  
 All came away.

<sup>1)</sup> Masfield's saloon was likewise a hotel, and the men lodging there 'were a sad set of drunkards, and needed pick-me-ups before they could face the day's work'.

La luz, que en un vaso  
Ardía en el suelo,  
Al muro arrojaba  
La sombra del lecho;  
Y entre aquella sombra  
Vejase á intervalos  
Dibujarse rígida  
La forma del cuerpo.

Despertaba el día  
Y á su albor primero  
Con sus mil ruidos  
Despertaba el pueblo.  
Ante aquel contraste  
De vida y misterios,  
De luz y tinieblas,  
Medité un momento:  
*"¡Dios mio, qué solos  
Se quedan los muertos!"*

De la casa en hombros  
Lleváronla al templo  
Y en una capilla  
Dejaron el féretro.  
Allí rodearon  
Sus pálidos restos  
De amarillas velas  
Y de paños negros.

Al dar de las ánimas  
El toque postrero,  
Acabó una vieja  
Sus últimos rezos;  
Cruzó la ancha nave,  
Las puertas gimieron,  
Y el santo recinto  
Quedose desierto.

De un reloj se oía  
Compasado el péndulo,  
Y de algunos cirios  
El chisporroteo . . . . .

The nightlight in a dish  
Burned on the floor;  
It threw on the wall  
The bed's shadow,  
And in that shadow  
One saw sometimes  
Drawn in sharp line  
The body's shape.

The dawn appeared.  
At its first whiteness,  
With its thousand noises,  
The town awoke.  
Before that contrast  
Of light and darkness,  
Of life and strangeness,  
I thought a moment —  
*My God, how lonely  
The dead are!*

On the shoulders of men  
To church they bore her,  
And in a chapel  
They left her bier.  
There they surrounded  
Her pale body  
With yellow candles  
And black stuffs.

At the last stroke  
Of the ringing for the souls  
An old crone finished  
Her last prayers.  
She crossed the narrow<sup>1)</sup> nave,  
The doors moaned,  
And the holy place  
Remained deserted.

From a clock one heard  
The measured ticking,  
And from a candle  
The guttering . . . . .

'This,' says Novalis, 'is the great prerogative of an autodidact, in spite of all the gaps and limitations which his knowledge may present, and which, indeed, are the inevitable outcome of his method, — that every new idea he picks up takes its place forthwith in the republic of his acquirements and ideas, assimilating thoroughly with the whole, which then affords opportunities for original combinations and numerous new discoveries.'<sup>1)</sup> Accordingly we are quite willing to ignore certain inaccuracies in the above translation, likewise such passages as reveal an imperfect knowledge of history, as in 'Philip the King', where he numbers the Dutch among the nationalities that manned the Armada — there were Hollanders among the galley-slaves, but that does not count — and mentions Parma as being

<sup>1)</sup> A slip for 'wide'.

<sup>2)</sup> „Ein Autodidaktos hat, bei allen Lücken und Unvollkommenheiten seines Wissens, die aus der Art seines Studierens notwendig entstehen, dennoch den grossen Vorteil, dass jede neue Idee, die er sich zu eigen macht, sogleich in die Gemeinschaft seiner Kenntnisse und Ideen tritt und sich mit dem Ganzen auf das innigste vermischt, welches dann Gelegenheit zu originellen Verbindungen und mannigfaltigen neuen Entdeckungen gibt." Bölsche's Ed. III 90.



blockaded 'in France', because Dunkirk is a French port now. We only demand of the author that he shall go from strength to strength.

But Masfield's literary career is as irregular, as full of ups and downs as the mental development of an adolescent.

## V.

With 'Salt-Water Ballads' his impulse to make himself the spokesman of the maimed and the halt and the blind 'in the rain and the cold' spent itself, fizzled out. Unlike Wilfrid Gibson who, after a remarkable introductory career as a purely romantic poet, espoused the cause of the disinherited and has remained their interpreter unto this day, Masfield soon allowed his romanticism and craving for 'beauty' to get the upper hand. 'The Everlasting Mercy' is a raucous song of triumph. The tragic fate of Jimmy in 'The Widow in the Bye Street' has very little to do with his status as a labourer. 'Dauber' indeed goes far towards redeeming Masfield's promises that his songs shall be fashioned, his tales shall be told about the men with the broken heads and the blood running into their eyes. But he was not long in perceiving that the fates of princes and be-medalled commanders constituted the proper raw material for a romantic author. After an abortive attempt to gang his own gait he was fain to return to the highroad of tradition.

'That the subject chosen is the fortunes of supermen is recognition of the fact that the great are more interesting than the small, and are the only people who really matter, in the judgment of the bulk of mankind. It is the theory of the game of Chess; the pawns do not matter. And they do not matter, because their loss does not seriously affect any result; whereas the withdrawal of an Achilles means the defeat and ruin of the rest. And Homer is not too inveterate a worshipper of the great to fail to furnish a reason for the reverence wherein they are held. The condition whereon they enjoy their honours is, as Sarpedon observes, that they fight in the first rank (Iliad XII, 321). It was their business to spend from youth to old age in hard warfare till they wasted away (XIV, 85). While then the interest in the doings of the great which largely dictates the contents of our newspapers is in part traceable to human vanity, in part it is based on recognition of the importance of these persons to the community.'

This is what Professor D.S. Margoliouth observes in his book on Homer ('The Homer of Aristotle', Blackwell, 1923, page 133), and while admitting a certain validity of the theory we may point out, first, that it ignores the importance of a man to himself, secondly that, apart from the great issues claiming the energy of mankind as a whole, each individual has his own fights to fight, and that it is a task meet for any poet to make outsiders sharers in the joys of such fights often waged against great odds; sharers in the quiet exultation of well-earned victories, in the solace of brief pauses of rest, in the stubborn will that refuses to accept defeat. Cannot an everyday experience in the life of an ordinary individual be made as interesting as anything about Attila, Tamburlaine or Julius Cæsar? What of Gibson's 'Summer Dawn'?

It is evident that Masfield's talents do not lie that way. Rob him of his clippers, of his Buccaneers, of his Gauchos, of his Corsairs, and you make him, if not entirely destitute, at any rate pretty short of poetical cash. Ever since the 'Ballads' volume of 1903 he has not ceased from invoking 'Beauty' (especially in 'Lollington Downs') reminding one rather — I am by no means assimilating the things compared — of Elijah's adversaries in

I Kings 18. <sup>1)</sup> I hold such invocations to be symptoms of weakness in any poet, let him be English Masfield or Dutch Boutens.

I do think I can appreciate Masfield's position, his stand-point. He has sometimes seen Beauty, and has more often caught glimpses of her. And now he wishes to *see* in order to render the things seen, making the world share his vision. It is the life-thought of poor *Dauber*, the runaway house-painter who wanted to render the beauty of sea and sky and ships, painting sea-scapes. But as a rule a painter does not care to paint views or faces which by common consent are 'beautiful', and if he does, the result will be insipid or at best, please only once. A painter is attracted rather by what is characteristic, and if he strives to render this, putting his heart and soul into the matter, the result, no matter whether it falls short in a few respects, will be beauty. A drunken boor by Adriaen Brouwer or Jan Steen will hold our pleased attention when a number of bergerettes by Greuze make us yawn.

And now two moods contend for the possession of an artist: joy at the thing achieved and at the certainty that we have it in us to achieve more, — and despondency, because our work, which satisfies others, yet fails to satisfy ourselves, because it does not give the full measure of what we had intended it should give. Where the first mood predominates we may expect outbursts like the following by James Stephens ('Songs from the Clay', 34):

I have a pipe of oaten straw,  
I play upon it when I may,  
And the music that I draw  
Is as happy as the day.

It has seven holes, and I  
Play upon it high and low;  
I can make it laugh and cry,  
I can make it banish woe.

Any tune you like to name  
I will play it at the word,  
Old or new is all the same,  
I'm as ready as a bird.

No one pipes so happily,  
Not a piper can succeed  
When I lean against a tree  
Blowing gently on my reed.

But even James Stephens, who of all the modern poets I know comes, I think, nearest to Browning's conception of *Fra Lippo Lippi*, confesses a moment after:

<sup>1)</sup> And they took the bullock which was given them, and they dressed it, and called on the name of Baal from morning even until noon, saying, O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered. And they leaped upon the altar which was made.

And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awakened.

And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.

And it came to pass, when midnight was past, and they prophesied until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice, that there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded. (26-29).

But there is a tune, and though  
 I try to play it day and night,  
 Blowing high and blowing low,  
 I can never get it right.

I know the tune without a flaw,  
 And yet that tune I cannot play  
 On my pipe of oaten straw,  
 Though I practise night and day.

And he winds up with the petulant outburst:

Little pipe! be good to me!  
 And play the tune I want to play,  
 Or I will smash you on a tree,  
 And throw your wicked halves away.

Masefield would not have said this. He is so familiar with the second mood that he looks upon failure as something normal, we might almost say as something devoutly to be wished. It is significant that in nearly all his poems (and in his prose stories likewise) the heroes fail in what they set out to do or are balked of the fruit of their labour and toil. When he writes a story of hidden treasure (I cannot recall the exact title of the spirited romance), unlike Stevenson, he causes the wrong people to make off with it. 'Captain Margaret' and 'Multitude and Solitude' are stories of failure. So is *Dauber*. So is *Right Royal*, the story of a horse that gains a race which is to make his master a rich man. But:

For the bets on Right Royal which Cothill had made  
 The taker defaulted, they never were paid;  
 The taker went West . . . . .

And now we understand why Masefield felt more and more drawn towards the real or apparent failures of princes and leaders, of Philip the Second, and Pompey the Great, and Julius Caesar. Their failures were, to him, more satisfactory from an aesthetic point of view. Their Dooms, involving vast numbers of people, were more important, more affecting. It was vastly consoling to be melancholy over them. Abt Vogler might brace himself with the reflection, 'On the earth the broken arcs, in the Heavens a perfect round', — your genuine man of sentiment reacts in a different way. 'The meaning shows in the defeated thing,' is a cryptic saying which admits of more than one interpretation. But what meaning the general run of 'lovers of poetry' will attach to the closing line of 'The Wanderer' (Coll. Ed. p. 374) is not doubtful. 'Blessed are ye that fail, for the successful ones are strong and bold and bad.'

It is only a very few poems by Masefield that end on a note of success. The two most important ones are 'The Everlasting Mercy' — one of his worst things, if not the worst of all — and 'Reynard the Fox', in my opinion — notwithstanding a lack of balance between the first part and the second, and in spite of some of his accustomed lapses — his best achievement as a narrative poet. In this enthralling thing Masefield has for once shaken off both his sententiousness and his wearisome preoccupation with 'beauty' and shows himself at his best. He has not yet surpassed it and it is unlikely he ever will.



## VI.

England has never been without gifted story-tellers in verse, but in our days narrative poetry has come to be looked upon askance by superior persons, who hold that it is not a poet's business to tell a story, because the exigencies of the story will prevent him from constantly dwelling in the light of the watery moon. It is a view from which I dissent whole-heartedly. I do not think that the poetical value of Browning's *Italian in England* is any the less for containing lines like:

'Now you must bring me food and drink  
And also paper, pen and ink,  
And carry safe what I shall write  
To Padua . . . .'

These indispensable lines are swift. They carry on the action instead of retarding and impeding it in the Swinburnian manner by a succession of hysterical dithyrambics, raptures and roses without an end, which soon weary an honest reader of, say, 'Tristram of Lyonesse' more than downright dullness would do.

Frank Harris once called the parable of the Prodigal Son a perfect prose poem, and I agree. But it is not because every incident of it is used as a peg to hang poetical thoughts upon. And it is not because its diction is at all laboured or in any way 'beautified'. Apart from the grandeur of its moral and religious teaching it contains a lesson to artists, it preaches the incomparable worth of sincerity and the boundless possibilities of simplicity. It is a lesson which Masfield seems reluctant to accept and act on, although he sometimes does, and is at his very best then . . . . .

The meet was at "The Cock and Pye  
By Charles and Martha Enderby,"  
The grey, three-hundred-year-old inn . . . .

The stables were alive with din  
From dawn until the time of meeting.  
A pad-groom gave a cloth a beating,  
Knocking the dust out with a stake.  
Two men cleaned stalls with fork and rake,  
And one went whistling to the pump,  
The handle whined, ker-lump, ker-lump,  
The water plashed into the pail,  
And, as he went, it left a trail,  
Lipped over on the yard's bricked paving.  
Two grooms (sent on before) were shaving  
There in the yard, at glasses propped  
On jutting bricks . . . .

Then, in the stalls where hunters were,  
Straw rustled as the horses shifted,  
The hayseeds ticked and haystraws drifted  
From racks as horses tugged their feed.  
Slow gulping sounds of steady greed  
Came from each stall, and sometimes stampings,  
Whinnies (at well-known steps) and rampings,  
To see the horse in the next stall.

('Reynard the Fox', Coll. Ed. p. 525).

But *effen is moeilik treffen*, as we say in Dutch; what we call the golden mean, balance, equilibrium, postulates craftsmanship, sureness of touch and

of taste. William Morris possessed it; though frequently uninspired he shows no such lapses as does Masfield, who, only a few years after that excellent stuff of 'Reynard the Fox', opened 'Right Royal' with the lines

An hour before the race they talked together,  
A pair of lovers, in the mild March weather.  
Charles Cothill and the golden lady, Em.  
*Beautiful England's hands had fashioned them.*

(My italics)

I cannot imagine any French author who, writing about a pair of lovers, would have committed a line like this. Fancy *les mains de la belle France les avaient formés*. It is an absurdity, since the hands of the most beautiful being may fashion the most ungainly things. Such lines argue a lack of humour. On no other supposition for that matter can I explain the presence, in the Collected Edition, of a 'poem' like 'Lollingdon Downs' XXII, which tells us about a drunken farmer who beat his daughter Jane:

Old Kyrle's son  
Said to his father:  
"Now, dad, you ha' done,  
I'll kill you rather!

"Stop beating sister,  
Or by God I'll kill you!"  
Kyrle was full of liquor —  
Old Kyrle said: "Will you?"

Kyrle took his cobb'd stick  
And beat his daughter;  
He said: "I'll teach my chick  
As a father oughter."

Young Will, the son,  
Heard his sister shriek;  
He took his gun  
Quick as a streak.

He said: "Now, dad,  
Stop, once for all!"  
He was a good lad,  
Good at kicking the ball.

His father clubbed  
The girl on the head.  
Young Will upped  
And shot him dead.

. . . . .

Will was hanged in Gloucester prison. As for Jane, she

walked the wold  
Like a grey gander; (fancy).  
All grown old  
She would wander.

She died soon:  
At high tide,  
At full moon,  
Jane died . . . . .

Surely this is simplicity with a vengeance. It is an extreme instance. But

minor instances are never altogether absent, and are all the more annoying when, as e.g. in *The Widow in the Bye Street*, they keep close company with sententiousness :

So tea was made and down they sat to drink;  
O the pale beauty sitting at the board!  
There is more death in women than we think,  
There is much danger in the soul adored . . . . .  
(Coll. Ed. p. 144).

And such sententiousness crops up in the most unlikely places, e.g. in the curious soliloquy of Anna the prostitute devourer of men, which is to be found on page 164. Then again there is pretentiousness in many of Masefield's *closes*. Compare the following one (that of *The Daffodil Fields*) with Matthew Arnold's close of 'Sohrab and Rustum', by which it was probably inspired :

In the day's noise the water's noise was stilled,  
But still it slipped along, the cold hill-spring,  
Dropping from leafy hollows, which it filled,  
On to the pebbly shelves which made it sing;  
Glints glittered on it from the 'fisher's wing';  
It saw the moorhen nesting, then it stayed  
In a great space of reeds where merry otters played.

Slowly it loitered past the shivering reeds  
Into a mightier water; thence its course  
Becomes a pasture where the salmon feeds,  
Wherein no bubble tells its humble source;  
But the great waves go rolling, and the horse  
Snorts at the bursting waves and will not drink,  
And the great ships go outward, bubbling to the brink.

Outward, with men upon them, stretched in line,  
Handling the halliards to the ocean's gates,  
Where flicking windflaws fill the air with brine,  
And all the ocean opens. Then the mates  
Cry, and the sunburnt crew no longer waits,  
But sings triumphant, and the topsail fills  
To this old tale of woe among the daffodils.

Apart from the fact that the last sentence is manifestly untrue, it is difficult to see what bearing the three closing stanzas have on the preceding story of Michael and Mary. And similar remarks might be made about *The River*, *The Widow in the Bye Street*, etc. even about *Dauber*, which for the rest I think a fine poem, surpassed only by *Reynard* and, perhaps, by *Biography*. But it is a curious thing to reflect on that Masefield should have been made famous by what may safely be considered his worst effort in verse. Its great defect is its false psychology. Observe how its reclaimed sinner, Saul Kane, in recounting his past misdeeds and his conversion, simply gloats over the wickedness of his sinful days, complacently using language which a man merely grown sober and decent (let alone one who triumphantly poses as a brand snatched from the fire) would not dream of sullyng his mouth with. My objection does not refer to the presence of such words in a poem — I am perfectly willing to admit that they sometimes have a task to fulfil — but to their being used by the wrong man, autobiographically. Saul Kane uses no reticence whatever, whereas even the worst characters that reveal themselves in Defoe's picaresque stories know when to be reticent. And the language, the diction of 'The Everlasting Mercy' is an incredibly heterogeneous mixture. Biblical English, slang, vulgarisms,



rusticisms, *da wirrt sich alles durch einander*. One moment the preterite of *come* is *come*, the next it is *came*. One moment Saul uses the Miltonian *writ*, the next the past participle *took*, and *You'd oughtn't beat your little son*. The diction of 'The Everlasting Mercy' is in itself sufficient to condemn it as a work of a art.

But *Reynard the Fox* is a joy, if not for ever, at any rate for years and years.<sup>1)</sup>

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

## Contributions to English Syntax.

### XIV.

#### On the origin of the anaphoric relative *that*.

In my last note I expressed the conviction that a student of syntax must not neglect the use of the comparative, by the side of the historical, method. I did not pretend to make a discovery in stating this, but may have been of use in reminding some students of a well-established principle, especially because the case treated is a very clear example. However valuable the comparative and the historical method in the study of syntax may be and no doubt are, its progress depends still more on something else, and this is a point that is not indeed disputed, but is undoubtedly apt to be lost sight of by students whose interests are scientific rather than what is called *practical* (but generally means no more than *directly useful to any superficial speaker or writer*). The point referred to is the minute study of the facts that are most fully available to us: the facts of the living language.

Before studying the history and origin of the modern anaphoric relative *that*, therefore, I will consider its use in present English.

(1) Unlike the relatives *who* and *which*, the relative *that* is only used anaphorically, not independently; put more clearly for some readers: *that* must have an antecedent.

(2) Whereas *who* and *which* may be used in any kind of what looks formally like an adjective (attributive) clause, *that* is never used in clearly coordinate clauses.

(3) Whereas *who* refers to personal, *which* to what may roughly be called non-personal antecedents, *that* may refer to any antecedent.

(4) *Who* (and *whom*) like *which* may form any part of the adjective clause that a noun can form; they may thus be the subject (*the man who came to see you*, etc.), or the object (*the book which you bought there*, etc.) or a prepositional adjunct (*the man of whom*, *the book of which you spoke*, etc.). But *whom* and *which* cannot be used as non-prepositional adverb adjuncts, and in this respect they differ from *that*.

As this point is never treated in grammars of modern English with the fullness its importance deserves, I will give a few examples.

At the time that Eustacia was listening to the rickmakers' conversation on Clym's return, Thomasin was climbing into a loft over her aunt's fuel-house. Hardy, *Return of the Native* II. ch. 2.

By the time that Wildeva reached her name the blankness with which he had read the first half of the letter intensified to mortification. *ib.* II. ch. 7.

Scarcely a year passed that six or seven persons were not drowned under the very windows of the town. (see *Accidence and Syntax*<sup>3</sup> p. 453).

"They would not receive Mary as their cousin," said he, "and I will go nowhere that she cannot go." (see *ib.*).

<sup>1)</sup> The Collected Edition (784 pages) was published by Messrs Heinemann in 1923 (8/6).

I quote the last two examples because I have no others at hand with a word denoting place for an antecedent, and also because Professor Ellinger, in his very appreciative review of the third edition of my book (*Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 35, p. 373), objected to my considering *that* as a relative here instead of as a conjunction (comparing "franz. *que* . . . *ne*, ohne *dasz*"). For it is this remark that induced me to consider the question of the origin of relative *that*.

(5) The relative *that* never takes a preposition before it; *whom* and *which* freely do so.

(6) The relative *that* is usually unstressed, at least in spoken English. Indeed, distance between the antecedent and the relative may prevent *that* being used; it seems to me to be a reason why in the following quotation *that* for *who* would be wrong.

Nobody could be said to understand the heath who had not been there at such a time. Hardy, *Return of the Native* I. ch. I.

\* \* \*

We will now turn to the explanation of the facts that has been suggested. Among the moderns Sweet does not in his *Syntax* express any opinion on the origin of the word. Neither is the question referred to in another mine of syntactical information: Deutschbein's *System der neuenglischen Syntax*. But the admirable Mätzner assumes that no proof is needed to show that the relative *that* is identical with the neuter demonstrative (III p. 557 ff.), and this explanation, which is supported by the parallelism of other Germanic languages is still, no doubt, the view that is looked upon as a matter of course.<sup>1)</sup>

Does the prevailing explanation account for the facts of Modern English enumerated above? It may be thought to explain no. 3: the modern demonstrative *that* does not distinguish gender either. Perhaps a case in favour of the demonstrative could also be made out with regard to no. 4. It has been little noticed that nouns without a preposition can be used in present English in adverb adjuncts expressing a point of time, not only in those expressing extent of time (representing the old accusative of extent in place or time). But this adverbial use is restricted; the preposition could not be spared in such a case as the following: 'It was done *at* a moment when he was not looking'. Now we do often find a non-prepositional adjunct when the noun is qualified by a demonstrative.

Nobody except himself came near the spot that night. Hardy, *Return of the Native* I. ch. 9.

The same hour the next evening found him again at the same place *ib. ib.*

Such strange thoughts as I have had from time to time, Eustacia; and they come to me this moment. *ib. ib.*

I will not go into the question of the non-prepositional adjuncts at present. For a comparison with other Germanic languages such as Dutch or German shows that these have in this case (no. 4) a real conjunction (*dat* or *dasz*) which is formally different from the pronoun. This, however, suggests the question: If *that* is an undoubted conjunction in the cases mentioned under no. 4, what reasons are there for calling it a relative pronoun in the other cases? For it is evident that there would be no difficulty in explaining any of the other five points enumerated above if we could look upon *that* as a conjunction. We do not expect a conjunction to form a subject or any

<sup>1)</sup> It is the view, e. g., of the writers of the ME. grammar reviewed in this number. Also of Onions, *Advanced English Syntax* §§ 247, 256.

other part of the clause that is introduced by it (points 1 and 2); we do not expect a conjunction to distinguish gender (point 3); we do not expect a conjunction to take a preposition (point 5), and a conjunction is generally weak-stressed (point 6).

Now the reason why a word is called a relative pronoun, apart from historical reasons (which, of course, are the most important by far), is that it has the function of a conjunction but at the same time can be looked upon as forming part of the clause introduced by it. According to this we must call *that* a conjunction in the case of point 4. But we *can* do the same for all the other points: it is, indeed, possible to look upon *that* as a part of the clause in the other cases, but it is by no means necessary. It is sufficient to remind the reader of the clauses without any connecting word (*Here is the book I bought you*). In these constructions ἀπὸ κοινού we have the proof that it is really the headword of the principal clause (i. c. *book*) that forms part of the subordinate clause. And, what seems conclusive, it is impossible to use *that* as an independent relative, i. e. in the only case where the pronoun *must* be looked upon as a part of the subordinate clause. The result of these considerations seems to be that a grammar of living English is not only justified in treating relative *that* as a conjunction, but even that to treat it as a relative pronoun is a concession to tradition that prevents us from thoroughly understanding the structure of present English.

It is hardly necessary to point out that conjunctions in the function of relatives are quite common in English and in related languages. In English grammar it is quite usual (and proper) to treat *as* and *but* as relative conjunctions. In English dialects, where *who* and *which* are rarely used, we mostly find *as*, *that*, and *what*; some dialects have *at*, a form that is variously explained as a clipping of *that* and as a Norse loanword (see Börje Briliöth, *A Grammar of the Dialect of Lorton*, p. 109, 134). It is noteworthy that the dialects that use the relative *at* also use *at* as a conjunction; the opinion of Briliöth, that it is a Norse borrowing, seems to be most reasonable. The conjunctive character of *at* is also shown by a remark made by Wright (*A Grammar of the dialect of Windhill* p. 125); “æt is invariably used when the antecedent is expressed; in other cases we always use uæ, wot”.

\* \* \*

After we have shown that present English does not possess a relative pronoun *that*, but only a conjunction of this form, the question must be answered what is the origin of relative *that*: is it now what it has always been, or have we a change from a pronoun into a conjunction in the course of English history? To answer this question we must turn to the time when relative *that*, in our sense, makes its first appearance. This is not the Old English period; Old English had a form *þæt*, but it was a *neuter* pronoun used both anaphorically and independently, and this cannot explain our form. We must turn to Early Middle English, to such a text, e.g., as *Lazamon*. Here we find relative *þat* by the side of the old *þe* to refer to persons as well as words denoting things or ideas, and independently of the gender of the antecedents. On the other hand the demonstrative pronoun (and the definite article) in *Lazamon* still retains many of its distinctions of gender and case, as any look into the text will show, and as is fully stated by Hoffmann in his dissertation *Das Grammatische Genus in Lazamons Brut* (Morsbach's *Studien zur englischen Philologie* no. 36). The same thing happens in other texts of the time; fuller information is to be found in a Heidelberg



dissertation by N. von Glahn, *Zur Geschichte des grammatischen Geschlechts im Mittenglischen vor dem völligen Erlöschen des aus dem Allenglischen ererbten Zustandes* (*Anglistische Forschungen* no. 53). We witness a gradual disappearance of the relative particle *þe*, but also of the Old English conjunction *þe*. There seems really no ground for saying that the invariable *at* or *that* takes the place of the Old English relative pronouns, but the facts of Early Middle English seem most naturally accounted for if we assume that Old English *þe*, whether used as an ordinary conjunction or as a relative (indeclinable) particle is gradually supplanted by the conjunction *that*.

This explanation of relative *that* would explain the similarities in its use (and the restrictions to which it is subject) between English and the Scandinavian languages, which have induced Jespersen (*Growth and Structure of the English Language*, p. 82) to suggest the possibility of Scandinavian influence. Mr. Onions, in his *Advanced English Syntax*, § 112, specially suggests this influence as an explanation for the rule that prepositions cannot precede *that*. It has already been pointed out, by Mr. Trampe Bødtker in his *Critical Contributions to Early English Syntax*, Second Series (1910, p. 12f.), that this word-order is really due to the verb, and not restricted to relative clauses.

Another question is whether this conjunctive origin of ME. *that* must also be assumed for relative *that* accompanied by a case of a personal pronoun. I refer to cases like the following from Chaucer's Prologue.

A knyght ther was and that a worthy man,  
*That* fro the tyme that he first began  
 To riden out, *he* loved chivalrie . . .  
 Prologue, 43ff.

There nas baillif, ne hierde, nor other hyne,  
*That* he ne knew *his* sleighte and *his* covyne;  
 ib. 603f.

Of course this construction is identical with the OE. *þe* and a personal pronoun.

\* \* \*

Since writing the above I have found that Einenkel (*Hist. Syntax* p. 115). quotes some Early ME. examples: Swo dude Job, *þe* nes non abuuen eorðe him ilich on almesse. OEH. II. — Alls iff he wære an sinnfull mann þatt wære himm ned to clennsenn. Orm. There is nothing, therefore, to prevent us explaining this construction as a continuation of the OE. one. And this is a support of the explanation of the simple relative that I have suggested. Indeed, it seems hardly possible to separate the two constructions.

Our conclusion is therefore that the Present English relative *that* is and has always been a conjunction.

E. KRUISINGA.

# Studien zu den neuenglischen Mundarten.

## I. Yorkshire.

### 1. J. WRIGHT, A Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill, London 1892.

(Vgl. die Besprechungen von Napier, Anz. f. d. Alt. 20, 30 ff.; Luick, Beibl. zur Anglia 4, 161 ff.; Bühlbring, Idg. Forsch. Anz. 6, 198 ff. Auch Kruisingas Anzeige von Schillings Oldham-Grammatik im Beiblatt 19, 33 ff. kommt in Betracht).

#### a) Uebersicht der Entsprechungen.

Unter § 50 fehlt *flām* § 206. -- Unter § 52 fehlt frz. *ō* § 218.

#### b) German. Kurze Vokale.

§ 57. In *avə* 'Hafer', *braznt* 'brazen', *dlazn* 'to glaze', *gad* 'to gossip', *latə* 'latter', *narə* 'narrow', *salə* 'sallow', *slavə* 'slaver', *sparə* 'sparrow' *šadə* 'shadow', *šalə* 'shallow', *tšavl* 'to nibble', stand *a* ursprünglich in offener Silbe; *rami* 'stark schmeckend u. riechend', gehört zu *ram*, nicht zu ae. *hramsa*; *satl* 'to settle' und *prast*, Prät. von 'to thrust', gehören nicht hierher.<sup>1)</sup> — § 58. *wotə* 'water' ist wichtig, da es, mit me. *wāter* gekreuzt, ne. *wōtə* ergeben hat. — § 60. Diese *e*-formen können kaum durch Umlaut erklärt werden, sondern die folg. Konsonanz (*sk*, *st*, *sp*, *tš*) dürfte den Übergang in *e* veranlasst haben. In *tagedə* hat auch das ne. *e*, *kesten* ist schon me., *weðə* erscheint schon ae. als *hweðer* = nhd. *weder* (Ablaut!). Bei *wesp* könne lat. *vespa* in Frage kommen, wie bei unserm *Wespe*; für *eltə* 'halter' u. *kredl* weiss ich allerdings keine Erklärung (vgl. aber ae. *hælfter*); *ev* 'have', *ez* 'has', *ed* 'had' sind unbetonte Formen mit Schwächung, wie ne. *when*, *then*, nhd. *wenn*, *denn*. — Zu § 63 gehört auch *þoə* 'to thaw'. — § 65. Hierher stellt sich auch *fleə* 'to flay' § 183. — § 67. Napier erklärt *meitš* als Mischung von *mete* und *match*. — *gear* beruht auf an. *gervi*, das Beispiel gehört also auf S. 34 unten. — § 69. In *loin* 'lane' liegt wohl eine Ablautsform vor, vgl. ne *nose*: nhd. *nase*. — § 70. *dreæg* 'to drawl' geht auf ais. *draga* zurück; auch *eæg* 'haw', *meæg* 'maw' *neæg* 'to gnaw', u. *seæg* 'saw' dürften skand. sein. — § 71. Zu *sadl* etc. vgl. das oben zu § 57 bemerkte; *mak* und *tak* sind wohl unbetonte formen, in *ransak* liegt Nebenton vor, *šak* ist vielleicht an *šakl* angelehnt? Vgl. dagegen *beæk*, *dreæk*, *keæk*, *reæk*, *seæk*, *steæk* mit alter Länge. — § 73. *beg* hat mit ae. *bedecian* nichts zu tun, *twenti* gehört nicht zu ae. *e* (ae. *twægentig*). Bei *etn*, *ənent*, *evm*, *fedə*, *getn*, *ledə*, *nevi*, *rekn*, *sevm*, *weðə* stand *e* urspröngl. in offener Silbe. Dasselbe gilt für (h) *evi*, *kemp*, *ketl*, *netl*, *peni*, *tletš* unter 2. — *mens* 'neatness' geht auf an. *menski* zurück, *nek* hat altes *e*, desgl. *šelf* (vgl. an. *skjalf*) und *welp*; umgekehrt hat *elder-trī* altes *a*, vgl. nnd. *alhorn*. Die Unterscheidung von ae. *ę* und *ě* war überflüssig. — § 74 unten. Hierher gehört auch *giə* § 68. — § 74. *tāə* 'tar' gehört zu § 74a (vgl. ae. Gen. *tēorwes*), *meə* 'mare' dagegen hat schon me. *ā* nach dem Mask. — § 77. *giv*, *kil*, *milk*, *siks*, *silvə*, *sistə*, *sitš*, *wilə*, *witš* gehören nicht hierher, da sie zum Teil altes *i*, z. T. altes *y* enthalten. Der ganze § ist zu streichen, vielleicht *šil* ausgenommen. — Ebenso verunglückt ist § 79, denn *dī* 'to die' beruht auf me. *dēzen* < aisl. *deyja*, *wīl* auf ae. me. *wēl*, *gīn* ist aus *gīvn* entstanden, *bīzm* und *wīzl* stammen aus der Schriftsprache. — § 80. *foťš* hat sein *o* durch Accentversetzung aus ae. *fēotode*, *jolə* aus ae. *gēolu*, *swolə* setzt ein ae. \**swolgian* voraus, *jon* ist dunkel (ae. *gēon*), *joən* ebenso rätselhaft wie ne. *yawn* (eine Mischung von ae. *gānian*

<sup>1)</sup> *satl* ist nach Handke S. 33 eine Mischung von ae. *setlan* und *sahtlian*.

und *gëonian* hätte höchstens \**yone* [= *joun*] ergeben). — § 82. In *riap* 'to reap' liegt gewiss kein altes *e* zu Grunde; Bülbring möchte ae. *rēpan* < *raupjan* als Etymon ansetzen, aber das hätte ja *rīp* ergeben, vgl. § 150. — § 83. *juak* 'yolk' stände besser unter § 105. — § 84. *geæn* entspricht doch nur teilweise ae. *gegri*. In ne. *fever* liegt ae. *ē* vor, um so merkwürdiger ist *feavæ*. — § 87. Afries. *breke* < \**bruki* trägt zur Erklärung von *breits* nichts bei, das wohl auf afrz. *breche* beruht und die Entwicklung von *leits*, *bleits*, *preits* (§§ 132, 138 u. 234) zeigt. Hier sieht man so recht, wie verkehrt es ist, Zusammengehöriges aus etymologischen Gründen auseinander zu reissen! — *wei* gehört zu *weit* 'gewicht' (ne. *weight*) und *weik* 'wick' hat ae. *i*. — § 88. In *brek*, *get*, *lek* liegt gewiss moderne Kürzung vor, wie in *tak*, *mak*, *šak*, etc. (§ 71). — 89. Zu *silk* gehört auch *milk*, aber *blis* u. *sin* (ae. *sīððan*) hatten alte Länge (ae. *blīðs*) und gehören daher zu § 160; *grunsil* ist Umbildung von ae. *g(r)undeswelge*; *wik* steht für *kwik*, ein aisl. *vik* 'stirring, moving' kenne ich nicht. — § 93. Zu *weit* cf. Morsbach, Urspr. der ne. Schriftspr. S. 69. — § 96. *sliu* 'slew' beruht auf ae. *eo*, *i*. — § 97 *ruš* ist wohl Lehnw., hat auch schon ae. *y*. — § 98. *striak* 'streak' stammt von mnd. *strēke*, *ðiaz* 'these' hat me. *ē* (nach dem sgl. *pes*). — § 100. *fofn* ist Neubildung (vgl. s. 135), *gospl* hatte altes *ō*, in *kopæ*, *olin*, *opm*, *trodn* etc. stand *o* in off. Silbe (vgl. § 110.) — § 104, 2. In *æfuæ* etc. liegt me. *ō* vor, in *spæ* (ae. *spura*), *wæd* und *wæld* dagegen *u*, in den zwei letzten Wörtern durch *w* hervorgerufen. — § 106. In *sāl* und *stūp* liegt doch me. *u* zu Grunde (cf. § 112 zur Entwicklung). — § 107. In *dul* und *kus*<sup>1)</sup> liegt altes *y* vor, in *dluv* 'glove' altes *ō*, in *flutæ* und *uvm* wohl *u*, wie Schreibung und Aussprache zeigen. — § 108. Für *den* u. *wen* wäre besser von den ae. *æ*-formen auszugehen! — § 110. Dieser § hätte sehr vermehrt werden können (s. oben zu § 100). — § 112. Dazu gehört auch *šul* < *šuvl* wie *æbūn* < *æbuvn*. — § 113, 3. *duæ* 'door' kann auch auf die Casus obl. von *dor* 'Tor' zurückgehn. — 115. *ānd* 'hound' ist Lehnwort, da und sonst bleibt; *drānd* 'to drown' beruht vielleicht auf Mischung von *druncian* und (*go*) *down*? — § 116. Woher stammt das *t* in *prift* 'through'? Es wäre in § 294 zu erwähnen gewesen. Stammt es vielleicht von ne. *aft*? — § 117. *brim* hat ae. *i*; *ig* beruht wohl auf aisl. *hyggja*. — § 121. Die Wörter mit *u* = ae. *y* sind als Lehnwörter zu betrachten.

### c) German. lange Vokale.

§ 123. *poæ* 'to thaw' gehört zu § 63, da es aus ae. *pawian* stammt. Aber *out* 'aught' und *nout* 'naught' beruhen auf ae. *ōwiht*, *nōwiht* (zu § 166), während *soul* offenbar Lehnwort ist. — § 124. Aus *oan* 'own' gegenüber *lou*, *ou* scheint hervorzugehn, dass *āg* im me. Inlaut anders behandelt wurde, als im me. Auslaut (vgl. 163 f. *duin*: *diu*). — § 126 *ut* 'hot' ist seltsam; *wun* stammt aus der Schriftsprache. — § 127. Was Wr. über die Möglichkeit sagt, *feak*, *leak*, *weak* als echt englische Wörter zu erklären, ist gewiss verfehlt. — § 129. Dass in ne. *sweep* der Vokal des Prät. (ae. *sweop*) ins Präsens gedungen sei, ist unglaublich. Wir haben wohl von aschwed. *svēpa* auszugehen. — § 131. Die Entwicklung von ae. *æ* = wgerm. *ā* in *briap* etc. beweist hier me. südl. *ē*, wie in der Schriftsprache. Bülbrings Erklärung durch konsonant. Einflüsse passt nicht für alle Beispiele und ist auch unwahrscheinlich, bes. in Fällen wie *briap*, *briað*. — § 132. Verkehrt ist gewiss die Entwicklung von *leits*, *speits* aus vorhergehender Kürzung. Das *i* wird sich vor *tš* entwickelt haben wie in me. *eishe* u. ä. (Bülbring). —

<sup>1)</sup> Nach Handke s. 44 auf ae. *cuss* neben *coss* beruhend.



§ 133. *blest* scheint zu ne. *blate*, *blatant*, lat. *blatīre* zu gehören, vgl. das N.E.D., *eā* 'hair' geht auf afrz. *haire* zurück, *weav* auf ae. *wafian*. So bleibt nur *græa* = ae. *græg*, *grēg* über, das sich zu *deā* 'day', *reān* 'rain', *tleā* 'clay' und skd. *leāk* 'play' stellt. — § 135. *blast* kann auch skand. Herkunft sein und stellt sich dann zu § 125 (*aks* etc.). — § 137. *siāt* 'seat' ist das skand. *sæti*, könnte also auch zu § 131 gestellt werden. Es fehlt *sniāk*. — Gegen die Fassung von § 138 ist dasselbe einzuwenden, wie gegen § 132; *reik* beruht nach Bülbring auf Mischung von *reits* und *rek*. — § 139. *lein* 'to lean' beruht eher auf ae. *hlēonian* und gehört dann zu § 87 (Napier); *spreid* ist gebildet wie *neid* und *treid* (§ 372) — aber wie erklärt sich das *ei* für *iā*? Eigentümlich ist auch *kei*, *nei* neben *tleā* § 141. — § 140. *tout* beruht auf ae. *tāhte* und gehört nicht hierher. — § 141. *leādi* geht, wie das ne. Wort, auf me. *lādi* zurück; *steaz* ist vielleicht Lehnwort? — § 149. *britšaz* ist wohl Lehnwort, *weast* ist = ne. *waste* (Napier), *wiəri* gehört unter § 151. — § 150. *lītnin* gehört eher unter § 93. — § 153. *eit* 'height' gehört zu *ei* 'high' § 182. — § 154. Ae. *mēd* ist nicht aus *meord* entstanden, also gehört *mīdlas* unter § 155. — § 156. Zu *aim* vgl. das zu § 258 bemerkte. In *braild* und *saīð* liegt ae. -ig-, nicht -ī- vor. Trotzdem heisst ae. *stigel* im Dialekt *stīl* und *tigele* erscheint als *tīl*. Also werden jene beiden wohl Lehnwörter sein, man müsste denn annehmen, dass *ig* vor *l* anders behandelt wäre, als vor *d* und *ð*. — § 158. *sī* 'to sigh' erklärt sich wohl durch Einfluss des me. Prät. *sīghte*, woraus *sīt* wurde; *skrik* dürfte Lehnw. sein, *stī* 'ladder' beruht auf an. *stige*, zeigt also mit Recht *ī*. Demnach ist § 158 zu streichen. — § 160. *midif* neben *waif* gehörte unter 'unbetonte Vokale'; es fehlt *blis*. — § 162. *sniāk* beruht wohl auf ae. \**snæcan*. — § 163. Hierher gehört auch *šuit* 'shoot' < ae. *sceōtan*, me. *shōte*. — § 164 unten: Auch *tū* '2' wird Lehnw. sein. — § 168. Von *skoup* 'scoop' gibt es im Ne. auch die Form *scope* [= *skoup*], entstanden aus afrz. *escope*, worauf auch die Windhiller Form beruht, vgl. *pouts* 'to poach' § 220. — § 170. In *wedānde* liegt natürlich eine Umlautsform vor, die allerdings im Ae. nicht belegt ist (vgl. *awfries. wernisdei*). — § 171. *ā* < *ū* setzt eine Mittelstufe *au* voraus; *trāst* 'to trust' < an. *treysta* hat sein *ū* vielleicht durch Einfluss von me. *troue* [l. *trūe*], ne. *to trow* [l. *trau*] < ae. *trūwian* (nicht *trūwian*!) erhalten. — § 172. *pāzde* geht auf verkürztes me. *thursday* < ae. *ðūres dæg* < an. *pōrs-dagr* zurück, vgl. § 113. — § 173. Wie kann *doān* 'Daune' Lehnw. sein? — § 174. *up* hat doch alte Kürze, vgl. ae. *upp*! — § 175. *brain* hat alter *ī*, nicht *y*. — § 178. *prust* ist wohl Lehnw. — § 180. *roā* 'raw': hier liegt ae. *hrēaw* zu Grunde. — § 181. Warum soll *tšik* Lehnw. sein? Aus angl. *cēce*, einerlei ob = ws. *cēace* oder *cēoce* (vgl. das N.E.D.) musste doch nach § 130 u. 187 *ī* werden (vgl. auch § 147). — § 183. *fleā* ist = ne. *flay* (nach dem Part. Prt.) und geht nicht auf ae. *flean* zurück; *neātā* zeigt alte Kürzung. — § 184 *loup* und *lous* beruhen auf an. *qu*, *goām* und *roād* auf an. *au*. — § 185. *gāt* 'great' zeigt natürlich Metathesis (vgl. auch § 90). — § 187. *līt* 'light' gehört eher zu § 93 (*iht* > *īt*): *tšiu*z weist auf me. *chūse*. — § 190. *jiup* 'youth' gehört doch nicht zu ae. *ēow*! Es beruht allerdings auf me. *yewthe* < ae. *gēogud*. In *eu* 'yew', *seu* 'to sew' und *tšeu* 'to chew' kann kein altes *ēaw* stecken, wie Wr. meint. Eine Erklärung ist mir jedoch unmöglich. — § 191. *šū* 'she' könnte vielleicht durch Accentverschiebung aus *šiu* (vgl. § 164, c) entstanden sein, wie ne. *lūd* < *llud*. Über *šuit* vgl. oben zu § 163.

#### d. Französischē Vokale.

§ 195. Zu *pleāstā* 'plaster' vgl. nnd. *plāstar*, nl. *plaaster* und *pleister*; zu letzterem würde *pleāstā* stimmen, vgl. *reān* 'rain', *beān* 'near' (an. *beinn*). Auch

frz. dial. *plaistre* käme in Betracht. — § 196. Zu *moəndž* vgl. me. *maunge* und § 198. — § 200. In *dons*, *ont* etc. liegt offenbar Kürzung < *o* vor, vgl. *fols* § 225. — § 201. *rediš* hat schon alte Formen mit *e*. — § 206. *flām* 'phlegm' scheint auf frz. *flēme* zu beruhen. — § 208. *piā* 'pear' ist entwickelt wie *fias* und *tlia* und setzt ein ne. \* *pīa* voraus (vgl. *to appear*). — § 212. *rens* geht eher auf an. *hreinsa* zurück. — § 213. In *krakit* liegt wohl Anlehnung an *to crack* vor, da auch das Heimchen so heisst. — § 215. Zu *nuvl* vgl. frz. *nouvelle*; auch *nuvis* wird durch frz. *nouveau* beeinflusst sein. — § 220. Da *ou* sonst nur vor *l* erscheint, ist *pouts* wohl Lehnw. — § 223. *foəfit* etc. gegenüber *fuədz* sind wohl Lehnw. — § 225. In *bəkos* liegt wohl unbetonte Form vor, in *fols* Kürzung wie in *dons* § 200. — § 226. Ende. *foisti* ist = ne. *foisty* (neben *fusty*), beeinflusst durch *moist*. — § 229. Zu *tšianə* vgl. das N.E.D. unter *china* II (älter ne. *tšēini*), *əblīdž* = frz. *obliger* ist doch klar, zu *leələk* vgl. die Formen *lelack*, *lailock*, *lalock* im N.E.D. — § 237. *kākumə* beruht auf Anlehnung an *kā*, vgl. das vulg. *cowcumber*.

### e. Unbetonte Vokale.

§ 243. *gimlæk* hat sein *-k* für *-t* wohl durch Anschluss an Wörter wie *lavrək*, *galək*, *stərək*, *leələk*, resp. ne. *hemlock*, *hillock*, *bullock* usw. erhalten. — *spitək* 'spigot' zeigt eigenartige Metathese; das *k* erinnert an *spike*. — Zu § 245 gehört auch *midif* § 160.

### f. Konsonanten.

S. 78, Z. 6. *kil* 'kill' hat kein *w* verloren, da es von ae. \**cyllan* stammt. — S. 79, § 256. *stūp* beruht auf me. *stulpe*. — S. 80, § 258. Der *r*-verlust in *aim* 'hoarfrost' erklärt sich leicht aus dem Kompos. *hoar-rime* mit falscher Abtrennung. — S. 81, § 262. Der *r*-verlust in *pim-ruəz* beruht auf Dissimilation (vgl. gr. *γαστήρ* < \**γραστήρ*). — S. 82, § 270. In *īmin* 'evening' ist das *m* doch nicht vokalisches, sondern *-vn-* ist hier zu *-m-* assimiliert. — *n* ist zu *m* geworden in *kemp* < ae. *cenep* (§ 73). — Unter *n* fehlt die Dissimilation von *mn* > *ml* in *tšimli* 'chimney' § 330. Vgl. Soester *omlbus* = *omnibus* und Kölner *kommuljōn* = *kommunion*<sup>1)</sup>. — S. 86, § 283, 2. Zu *īmin* und *steim* (me. *stefnen*) vgl. das oben zu *īmin* bemerkte. Es fehlt *iəzinz* 'eaves' mit Schwund des *v* vor *z*. — § 284. *təv* 'to' vor Vokalen beruht wohl auf dem Gegenteil *ə(v)*. — S. 87, § 286. Zu *poreəts* 'potatoes' vgl. *porridge* < *pottage*. — § 287. Steht *misl* 'cow-house' nicht eher für *milk-stall*? Nebenbei: *sts* wird *s* in *bīəs* 'beasts' (S. 109, § 338). — Zum *t*-schwund vgl. noch *faks* 'facts' § 322 und *wəsit* § 305. — S. 88, § 291. In *prād* 'proud' ist das *d* doch schon altenglisch, wie in ne. *pride*. — In *buzəd* 'butterfly' möchte ich Einfluss des Suffixes *-ard* (wie in *buzzard* 'Bussard') annehmen, in *bəd* 'but' ist der Auslaut dem Anlaut angeglichen. — § 292. Vgl. noch *brekfəs* 'breakfast' mit *t*-schwund<sup>2)</sup>. — § 294. In *vāment* 'vermin' liegt wohl Analogie nach den zahlreichen Wörtern auf *-nt* vor<sup>3)</sup>; über *prift* vgl. zu § 116. — § 301. In *bran niu* ist *-d* natürlich zwischen den zwei *n* geschwunden, in *pāzn* '1000' und *uzbn* 'husband' liegt Neubildung nach dem Plural vor (vgl. § 302), *ən* 'and' beruht auf Satzphonetik, die Part. *bun*, *fun*, *wun* endlich sind aus *bundn*, *fundn*, *wundn* zu erklären, wonach sich die Prät. *ban*, *fan*, *wan* gerichtet haben<sup>4)</sup>. — S. 92, oben. Der Übergang von *ðə* > *tə* in *tə* 'thou'

<sup>1)</sup> S. auch Franzmeyer, Studien, Strassb. 1905, S. 9.

<sup>2)</sup> S. dazu Grüning, Schwund und Zusatz von Konss. Strassb. 1904, S. 30.

<sup>3)</sup> Vgl. ebenda § 52.

<sup>4)</sup> Vgl. ebenda § 27. u. 28.

beruht gewiss auf Satzphonetik, indem *tp* > *t* assimiliert und *sp* > *st* dissimiliert wurde, vgl. S. 118. In *wen tət* 'when thou art' muss dann Analogiebildung vorliegen, vgl. das nhd. vulgäre *wenstə* 'wenn du' nach *willstə*, *kannstə*, *hastə*, usw. — Ebd. 2. In *moæk* 'maggot' ist schwerlich ein *ð* geschwunden, vgl. me. *mauk* (§ 51, 2). — Ebd. 3. Das -*ð* in *buið* 'booth' und *smuið* 'smooth' beruht wohl auf den flektierten Fällen; bei letzterem könnte auch das ae. Adverb *smōðe* vorliegen. — S. 93, § 310, 1. In *šū* 'she' liegt schwerlich altes *s-* zu Grunde, sondern man hat von ae. *heo*, me. *yō* 'sie' auszugehn, das mit vorhergehendem -*s* zu *šū* verschmolz, vgl. Lindkvist, Anglia 45, 1ff. — S. 94, 2. In *siðez* 'scissors' möchte ich eher Dissimilation annehmen. — § 311. Der *s*-schwund in *pei*, *ridl*, *šimi*, *tšeri* erklärt sich als Neubildung, da man die Formen auf -*z* als Plurale auffasste. — S. 96, 2. *kil* geht nicht auf ae. *cwellan*, sondern auf \**cyllan* zurück. — S. 97, 4. *miks* beruht eher auf dem Part. *mixt* < lat. *mixtus*. — Ebd. 5, unten. *wik* 'quick' möchte ich lieber < *kwik* erklären, vgl. den *p*-schwund in *wen* und *witl*, sowie *wišin* § 325. — S. 100, 3. *sed* 'said' geht schwerlich auf ae. ws. *sāde* zurück. — Ebd. Sollten *sail* und *saið* nicht einfach Lehnwörter sein? — S. 101, d. In *uf* 'displeasure, rage' steckt das ne. *huff*. — S. 102, c. *dreæg*, *eæg*, *meæg*, *neæg*, *seæg* sind wohl skand. Lehnwörter, *ig* 'mood' könnte auf Mischung von ae. *hyge* und anord. *hugr* oder *hyggja* beruhen. — S. 103, § 319. Zu *þrif* 'through' (wohl die absolute Form) vgl. nordengl. *thof* 'though'. — S. 104, § 324. Der Übergang von *kw-* > *tw-* findet sich auch im Nordfries. (Lindholm).

### Formenlehre.

S. 325. Zu *wišin* 'cushion' vgl. me. *quischen* und *kwik* > *wik*. Warum aber ist hier nicht *tw-* eingetreten? — § 339. Über endungslose Genitive im Me. vgl. Napier in seiner Anzeige S. 34, der me. Beispiele anführt. — S. 111, § 340. Steckt in *sitš an a steat* nicht etwa das afrz. *estate*? — S. 115, § 348. *þribl* ist eine Mischung von *tribl* 'treble' + *þrē*. — Die Entstehung der Form *tā*, *tə* 'thou' ist trotz Wrights Widerspruch auf S. 118 klar genug: es entstand 1) in *āt* 'art', *out* 'oughtest' und *dāst* 'durst' durch Assimilation, und 2) in allen übrigen Formen der 2. sgl. Ind. Präs. des Verbs auf -*s* durch Dissimilation (*sp* > *st*). Die Unbetontheit spielt dabei keine Rolle. Für den Übergang von *sp* > *st* vgl. ne. *lest* < ae. *þy lās þe*. So wird auch der Artikel *t* aus *þe* nach Spiranten entstanden sein, vgl. *has þe*, *was þe*, *is þe*, *if þe* usw. — S. 119. Ist *šū* 'she' statt *šiu* vielleicht Lehnwort? — § 362. Über Prät. wie *beəd* 'bode' vgl. Napier, der es für Entlehnung aus nördl. *ā* hält u. Bülbring, der anord. *ei* heranzieht. Keine der beiden Erklärungen wirkt aber überzeugend, daher wage ich eine neue. Man könnte annehmen, dass der qualitative Unterschied zwischen ae. Sgl. *bād* und dem Plur. *bidun* zu *bād* : *badun* in me. Zeit ausgeglichen worden wäre; wenn dann *baden*, woraus regelrecht *bād* > *beəd* wurde, auch in den Sgl. drang (vgl. nhd. *stieg* zu *stiegen*) war das neue Paradigma fertig. — S. 135. *fēal* 'fought' entspricht nicht dem ae. *fēaht*, resp. *fæht* (vgl. *eit* '8'), sondern stammt aus der 4. und 5. Klasse, vgl. als Muster für *feit* : *fēat* : *fofn* das Paradigma *steil* : *steal* : *stoun* oder *neid*, *speik*, *spreid*, *treid* und *weiv*. S. 136, § 371. Gegen die Erklärung von *eə* im Prät. der 4. Klasse protestiert Bülbring mit Berufung auf seine Gesch. des Abl. der st. Verba S. 60f. — S. 138 oben. Das P.P. *dug* ist wohl nach *stuk* gebildet. — § 377. *þoə* 'to thaw' beruht auf ae. *þawian*, nicht *þāwian* oder gar *þāwan* (sic)! — S. 163, § 397. Der eigentümliche Ausdruck *ius tə wod* 'to be formerly wont or



willing to do a thing', z. B. in *ðā ius tē wəd elp mē nā an ðen* 'they were formerly wont or willing to help me now and then' (vgl. § 305) beruht auf Konstruktionsmischung: *they used to help me + they would help me*. § 400. Die Formen *æ(v)*, *i(n)*, *æ: on* hätten unter *f* und *n* in der Lautlehre erwähnt werden sollen. — S. 168. *nær* 'nor' beim Komparativ entstand in Wendungen wie: *he is older, nor I* 'er ist älter, und nicht ich'.

2. A. HANDKE, Die Mundart von Mittel-Yorksh. um 1700.  
(Dissert. Giessen 1912).

S. 52 unten. Die ae. Form *hweðer* brauchte nicht besternt zu werden, da sie wirklich vorkommt. — S. 54, unten. *To speer* 'sperren, festmachen' geht auf eine Form mit einf. -r- zurück, vgl. mnd. *speren*, das zu an. *spari* gehört; me. *speren* würde also einem ae. \**sperian* oder an. \**sperja* entsprechen. — Die Form *eap* 'hope' S. 61 unten ist noch unerklärt, denn ein Verweis auf dä. *haab* oder ndl. *hoop* bedeutet nichts. — *trow*, S. 68, beruht nicht auf „ae. *trūwian* neben *trowian*“, sondern auf ae. *truwian* oder *treowan*. — S. 88, 2. Wenn *p-* nach -s zu *t-* wird, z. B. *sesta* 'sagst du', so würde ich dies eher Spirantendissimilation (vgl. ne. *height*) als Assimilation nennen.

3. W. KLEIN, Der Dialekt von Stokesley in Yorkshire,  
North-Riding. (Palästra 124).

(Vgl. die Anzeigen von Horn, Lit. bl. 37, 56 ff. und Brunner, Herr. Arch. 133, 457 ff.).

a. Quantität.

S. 91, § 140. *sæik* 'solch' ist wohl Mischung von nordengl. *sic* + anord. *slīkr*. Vgl. auch S. 161, § 210. — S. 95, § 145, *liæst* 'lest' entspricht nicht ae. *læst*, sondern ist der Kompar. *læs + þe*. — Wie kann man *fliæd* und *fiæd* mit ne. *fled* und *fed* überhaupt zusammenstellen? — *hiþ* dürfte von *hiæl* 'to heal' beeinflusst sein. — S. 96. *hod* hat seine Kürze (wie in Windhill) vom Part. Prt. *hodn*.

b. Kurze Vokale.

S. 100 unten. *didæ* 'to shiver' neben *dodæ* und *dadæ* gehört nach Falk-Torp (vgl. auch Hellquist, Svensk etym. ordb. S. 96) nebst norw. *dudra* zu gr. *δύσσομαι* < \**διδύσομαι*. Allerdings müsste *dadæ* eine neugebildete Ablautsform sein, wie nhd. *tattern*, *Tatterich*. — S. 101 oben. *swig* hat natürlich mit *swelgan* nichts zu tun! Solchen Unsinn sollte man Skeat nicht mehr nachschreiben! — S. 102, § 150. *sleit* braucht nicht auf aniederd. *slight* (so!) zurückgeführt zu werden, vgl. das N.E.D., da sowohl ae. \**sleht*, \**sliht* wie urnord. \**slehtaz* > *slétr* zur Verfügung stehen. — S. 103, § 151. Dass ae. *Crist* kurzen Vokal hatte, ergibt sich nach Sievers schon aus satz- und versmelodischen Gründen. — S. 104 unten. ne. *left* hat *e* < *y*. — S. 110: *pat* hat schwerlich ein -l- verloren; nach dem N.E.D. ist es schallnachahmend (vgl. auch wfries. *pat* 'Kuss'). — S. 111 und 162, § 213: das -d- in *spandæ niu* 'span-new' bleibt unerklärt; es wird wohl eine Analogiebildung sein. — S. 115. Die Bemerkung über *kaalin sundæ* (zu ne. *care*) ist kaum richtig, vgl. auch das N.E.D. oder DD. *carling* bedeutet zunächst 'altes Weib' (< an. *kerlingr*), dann 'getrocknete Erbse', wie man solche in Westfalen *græe* oder *olle wuiver* 'graue, alte Weiber' nennt. Weil man diese am gen. Tage ass, ist er danach benannt worden. — S. 116. *boksin* 'buxom' möchte ich wegen früh-me. *būhsum* und nl. *buigzaam* doch lieber von einem ae. \**būhsum*, als von \**bōcsum* ableiten: vgl. *o = u* unter § 160, S. 122 unten! — S. 124. oben. Ne. *shoulder* setzt, wie nl. *schouder*, ein altes -o- voraus.

## c. Lange Vokale.

S. 143 oben. *buuæst* 'to boast' beruht zunächst auf afrz. *boster*, dies auf norw. *bausta*. Mit ae. *bōgan*, *bōn* hat es nichts zu tun.

## d. Diphthonge.

S. 151 oben. *hoiti* zu mnl. *hoetelen*? Sehr verdächtig! — § 192. *tiæn* 'tune' könnte nach S. 144 doch auch auf afrz. *ō* beruhen. — S. 153. *ɔkæd* 'awkward' kann nicht auf an *ɔfugr* zurückgehn, da dies das -k- nicht erklärt. Vielleicht dürften wir afrz. *gauc* (fem. *gauche*) heranziehn: \**gaukward* + \**aw(g)ward* ergab *awkward*. — S. 156 oben. *guuəd* < an. *gaukr* ist wohl durch ne. *good* beeinflusst.

## e. Konsonanten.

S. 160, § 208. In *han̄kutše* 'handkerchief' liegt nicht "Suffixvertauschung", sondern ein andres Wort (ne. *cheer*) vor. — S. 161. oben: wie kann wohl *sarə* und 'to serve' von *narə*, *marə* beeinflusst sein? Da fehlt doch jede Beziehung! Eher würde ich an *follow* denken. — S. 162, § 211. Sollte in *Widbi* 'Whitby' nicht eher Anlehnung an *wide* vorliegen? — § 212. In *boksin* 'buxom' liegt vielleicht Dissimilation von *b—m* > *b—n* vor. Vgl. das Umgekehrte in *ransom* < *ranson*.

4. G. H. COWLING, *The Dialect of Hackness* (N. E. Yorksh.)  
Cambridge 1915

(Vgl. Battersby, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* 12, 33 ff.)

S. XIX. (*h*)*ig* 'sulks' beruht nicht auf ae. *hycge* (sic!) sondern auf dem Verbum *hycgan*, oder an. *hyggia*. — S. 13, § 52, 1. *bren* 'burn' hat Umlauts-*e*, *nek* dagegen altes *e*. — S. 16 oben. me. *wrethe* 'wrath' hat ae. *æ* < *aii*, vgl. ae. *wræððo* neben *wræð*, aisl. *reiðr*. — Ib. 7. In me. *stere* 'stir' steckt altes *y*, vgl. ae. *styrian*. — § 61, 2. 1st ne. *moor* skand.? — S. 18, § 65, 2. Ne. *sprawl* beruht doch auf ae. *spréawlian*. — § 91. Kann *tšat* 'pine-cone' = schwed. *kotte* (so, nicht *kotte*!) sein? Es ist offenbar das ne. *chat* < frz. *chat* 'Kätzchen', vgl. *chat* s.<sup>3</sup> im NED. — § 96. *n̄p* 'to knock on the head' < *naupe* möchte ich lieber auf ein an.\* *hnaupa* (zu got. *hniupan*, ae. *hneopan*, schwed. *nypa*) zurückführen. Vgl. die Synonyma S. XV. — § 97. *āli* 'early' gehört doch nicht unter ae. *ear*! — § 99. *weðar* 'which of the two' kann auch auf ae. *hweder* beruhen. — S. 30, § 104. Warum erscheint 'earnest' einmal als *ārist*, dann aber als *jenist*? — § 106. *wizn* 'weasand' gehörte unter § 140. — § 108. Über *ig* vgl. oben zu S. XIX. — § 111. Dass *u* in *brunstn* etc. auf nicht-umgelautetem *u* beruhen könnte, ist unglaublich. — § 116, S. 34. Dass *bodi* und *popi* kurzen Vokal haben, ist doch ganz in der Ordnung. — ib. 1. ae. *hogg* st. *hogge*. — § 128. *mæst* ist gewiss durch den Komp. *mæ* (§ 129) beeinflusst, vgl. das nhd. dial. *mehrste*. — § 130. Sollte *wīst* 'waist' nicht französisch sein (afz.\* *waste* < ahd. *wahst*)? Das würde auch den Diphthongen erklären. — Ib. In *lam* liegt Einfluss des Plur. vor (ae. *lambru*). — § 133. *rīad* 'to read' und *rīas* 'race' gehören doch nicht zu den Fällen des Umlauts von *ā*! — § 134. *līan* 'Lohn' beruht nicht auf wgerm. *ā*. — § 148, 4. *līt*, Prät. von *līt* 'to alight', ist natürlich eine Analogiebildung, zeigt also keine lautgesetzl. Kürzung. — § 156. Warum soll *lāt* 'little' auf älterem \**lāl* beruhen? — S. 48, § 159. Die vulgäre Entrundung in nhd. *Tür* ist keine Erklärung für dialekt. *tā* in *flītā* 'floor', da sie sich nicht bloss vor *r*, sondern überall findet, wo man *i* für *ī* und *e* für *ē* spricht. — Ib. Fussn. ahd. und ital. *scuola* stehen nicht auf gleicher Stufe denn in jenem ist *ō* > *úo*, in diesem *o* in offener Silbe > *uo* geworden. — § 162. Der Diphthong von *pūa* und *mūa* stammt wohl aus der Schriftsprache. —

§ 168. In *ræal* 'rail' liegt afrz. *ei*, in *twean* aber *ēz* < *æz* vor. — S. 52 Fussn. ae. *clēa* ist keine „shortened form of *clawu*“, sondern der lautgesetzliche alte Nominativ. — § 177. *streit* 'straight' beruht auf ae. *streht*, nicht *striht*. — § 193. *mal* 'to shout' gehört eher zu ae. *mæðlan* als zu an. *mæla*. — § 196. Wie erklärt sich der Anlaut von *šōm* = an. *skálma*? — § 198. *kletš* beruht wohl auf aisl. *klekja* + e. *hatch*. — § 198. Ist *renda* wirklich zu ais. *renna* zu stellen? *sled* 'sledge' ist das mnl. *sledde*, nicht isl. *sleði*. — § 203. *kāl* 'man' gehört unter § 197. — § 205. *grip* beruht auf ae. *grype*; *kinl* hat altes *y* (vgl. § 205, wo es nochmals steht!); *smit* beruht auf ae. *smittian*. — § 211. *skopæril* 'skipjack' hat mit aisl. *skapt-kringla* schwerlich etwas zu tun, sondern gehört eher zu aisl. *skopa* 'laufen'. — § 213. *fos* 'waterfall' kann auch auf aisl. *foss* beruhen. — § 217. *dræt* 'to drawl' gehört vielleicht zu westf. *drat-viðl* 'geschwätziges, klagendes Weib'. — § 226. *dī* 'to die' durfte nicht mit *stī* 'ladder' zusammengestellt werden. — § 233. Dass *liuk* 'to weed corn' durch *look* < ae. *lōcian* beeinflusst sein sollte, ist unglaublich. — § 236. Beruht *dōn* 'down' vielleicht auf ne. gesprochenem *dawn* (vgl. *au* > *ō* § 241 ff.)? — § 247. Die Herleitung von *gumšn* < *gaumr* und von *trust* < *traust* scheint mir sehr problematisch. — § 256. Sollte *salæri* 'celery' etwa an *salary* angelehnt sein? — § 291. In *renš* 'to rinse' steckt altes *i*, vgl. § 260. — § 294. Ist *foisti* 'fusty' vielleicht durch *moist* beeinflusst? — § 297, a. Dass *poua* 'to pour' etwas mit afz. *pur*er zu tun hat, bezweifle ich. — § 319 l. ae. *swōgan*. — In *seik* liegt wohl Mischung von aisl. *slīkr* mit me. *sic* vor. Vgl. § 228. u. 328. — S. 84, § 319. Ist *rezl* = ne. *weasel*? — § 354. In *onkotšə* ist kein *f* abgefallen, denn das letzte Wort ist ja afrz. *chiere*. — § 359. Der *v*-zusatz in *frev*, *iv*, *tiv*, *wiv*, *div* beruht wohl auch auf dem Wechsel von *ov* und *o* im Satzgefüge. — § 363. *korən* 'current' wird aus dem Plur. *korəns* < *korənts* stammen. — § 369. In *šipət* (§ 387) ist *-d* > *t* geworden. — § 370. Vgl. noch *šibin* § 387. — § 376. Auch in *sled* 'sledge' steht *d* für *th* (§ 198). — § 379. Wenn der artikel *t* wirklich auf *th* < *the*, nicht auf *that* zurückgeht, dürfte er zuerst (durch Dissimilation) vor Spiranten entstanden sein: *tfist*, *tsōt*, *tšap*, *twial*, *tpiml* usw., dann weiter analogisch ausgedehnt. — § 386. Es heisst ae. *pise*, nicht *pisa*. — § 399 *miks* geht eher auf lat. *mixtus* zurück. — § 462. Das Part. Prt. *sīn* < me. *sēne* ist nicht vom Inf. gebildet, sondern entspricht ae. *gesīene*, angl. *gesēne* 'sichtbar'. — Über das Verhältnis von *ta* zu *tane* und *ma* zu *made* s. unten. — S. 137, b. Ne. *slā* kann auch echt nordenglisch sein, vgl. nordh. *slān*. — S. 138 oben. Für *tekin* l. *tekin*n. Das P. P. *tan* ist aus *taken* entstanden und dazu ist dann der Inf. *ta* gebildet. Cowling stellt den Vorgang falsch dar. — Ib. ds. *flea* kann auch auf nordh. *flān* beruhen. — S. 140, § 464. *swīp* beruht schwerlich auf der Analogie von *slīp* und *wīp*, sondern wohl auf aschwed. *svēpa* < *sveipa*. — § 468. Wie kommt *kil* unter die unregelmässigen Verba? — S. 144. *wiš* kann auch direkt auf *wyscan* zurückgehn, vgl. *flesh*. — S. 146 oben l. *frettan* st. *fretan*. — § 475. *šəp* 'to shape' kann doch vom ae. Part. Prt. *gescēapen* stammen! — ib. *miəd* 'made' geht auf unbet. me. *makede* zurück, dazu wurde der ne. me. Inf. *ma* gebildet, wobei *ta* und *sla* ausser Spiel zu bleiben haben. — § 476. *gan* 'to go' ist nach dem P. P. *gian* gebildet und kann nicht auf *gaŋ* < *ganga* beruhen. — Ib. z. 4 v. u. l. *div it* statt *di it*. — S. 149. § 480, *mud* 'might' ist wohl nach *kud* gebildet. — S. 150 oben. *must* beruht nicht auf ae. *mōste*, sondern ist nach me. *schulde*, *thurfte*, *durste* gebildet. — Ib. l. *munda* st. *munða*. Sollte *mōnt* nicht = *mōnt* 'may not' sein? Vgl. westf. *mochte* 'mochte' und 'musste'.



## Notes and News.

**A Note on the Comparison of Adjectives.** If there is one thing on which English grammarians are agreed, it is that the use of the suffixes *-er*, *-est* depends chiefly on the number of syllables of the word. It is my object in the present note to show that the number of syllables of the word is of no influence whatever.

As early as 1911, in the first edition of my *Accidence and Syntax* (p. 244), I pointed out that the dissyllabic adjectives that take the suffixes end in a sound that may be syllabic or non-syllabic. Thus *l* is syllabic in *noble*, non-syllabic in *nobler*. In a few cases the final syllable contains a sound that is undoubtedly syllabic in all cases or at least when *-er*, *-est* are added, e.g. *pleasanter*, *stupider*, etc. but even here the result is that the number of syllables after the strong-stressed syllable is not fully two, because the medial syllables of these words are extremely short.

It has occurred to me that the number of syllables after the strong-stressed syllable is the decisive factor, not the number of syllables of the word. In other words, we can use the suffixes, 1. if the word ends in a stressed syllable (*great*, *polite*, *impolite*), and 2. if the word is stressed on the penultimate syllable followed by a syllable with a vowel-like (noble, happy, trustworthy, pleasant) or by a syllable with very weak stress (*wicked*, *rugged*).<sup>1)</sup>

It seems, therefore, that we have a case of a natural clausula<sup>2)</sup> here, about which classical scholars have become very enthusiastic in the last thirty years.

E. KRUISINGA.

**English Studies at Groningen.** Professor Kern, of the University of Groningen, has been appointed Professor of Dutch in the University of Leiden. Prof. Kern has held the Chair for English for nearly 24 years. When he succeeded Professor Bülbring in 1901, Dr. Kern had chiefly occupied himself with Dutch and with Slavonic languages. He soon showed that an able man can quickly become a master in a related branch of scholarship. If we ask what are the results of his tenure of the post we must remember that up to a couple of years ago it was impossible in Holland to pass a university examination in English or to take a degree in it. But the number of masters who owe their training to Kern is considerable, and among them there are some who have shown more than ordinary ability, which is all the more to be valued because the usual compulsion of the dissertation was absent in their case. The present periodical owes some of its most important articles to the Groningen school; we may mention Mr. J. Kooistra, Mr. A. G. van Kranendonk, Fr. A. Pompen, and Mr. J. H. Schutt, and among recent additions to our list of contributors Mr. A. Bosker. — During his English career Professor Kern has contributed important articles to various periodicals, chiefly German. Since *English Studies* was established he has been one of its most valued contributors on Old English. In spite of this he never gave up his Dutch work, as was shown by his elaborate treatise on the perfect tenses in Dutch, published by the *Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen*. We hope that in his new post he will not entirely neglect the study of English, nor *English Studies*.

<sup>1)</sup> It seems that adjectives with a living suffix, even if answering to these conditions, do not take the suffixes: *foolish*, *hopeless*. — Z.

<sup>2)</sup> Compare Albert C. Clark, *Prose Rhythm in English*. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1913.

## Translation.

1. It was a pretty little house in an untravelled corner of Normandy near the sea; a country of orchards and colzafields, of soft green meadows where cattle grazed and of long elm-shaded country-roads.

2. One was rather surprised to find this house just here, for all the other houses in the neighbourhood were rude farm-houses or labourers' cottages and this was a coquettish little villa, white-walled, with slim windows and balconies of twisted ironwork and Venetian blinds: a gay cottage standing in a bright little garden among rosebushes and geraniumbeds and smooth lawns. 3. Beyond the garden there was an orchard where rows of gnarled apple-trees bent towards one another like fantastic figures arrested in the middle of a dance.

4. A board nailed to the wall confirmed in roughly-painted characters the information I had received from a house-agent in Dieppe. 5. The house was to let, and I had driven out — a drive of two long hours — to view it. 6. Now I stood on the doorstep and rang the bell, a large bell, hung in the porch with a pendent handle of bronze, wrought so as to resemble a rope and tassel. 7. The sound would carry far on that still country air.

8. At least it carried as far as a low thatched farm-house (situated) about a hundred yards down the road. 9. Presently a man and a woman came out of the farm house, gazed for an instant in my direction, and then moved towards me: an old man and an old grey woman: the man in corduroys, the woman wearing a white cotton cap and a blue apron; both moving with the burdened gait peculiar to peasants. 10. I explained to them that I had come to inspect their house. 11. For the rest, they must have been expecting me; the agent had said that he would let them know. 12. But to my amazement this business-like announcement seemed for some reason or other to embarrass, even it appeared to me, to distress them. 13. They raised their tired old faces to me and exchanged anxious looks (with each other). 14. The woman clasped her hands nervously working her fingers.

15. "But surely the agent has written to you? 16. I understood from him that you would expect me at this hour", I said.

17. "Certainly", the man admitted, "we were expecting you". 18. But he made no motion to advance matters.

19. "The house is already let, perhaps?" I suggested.

20. "No, the house is not let", he said.

**Observations.** 1. *Unfrequented corner*: He told me that he was on the look-out for a quiet *unfrequented place* on the seashore, where he might rusticate and sketch (H. James: A Landscape Painter). *Out of the way*: It looked like business from cellar to attic — an amazing little place to find in an *out-of-the-way* village. (H. G. Wells: The First Men in the Moon Ch. I). Solidified spirit is not always procurable in *out-of-the-way* places. (Royal Magazine Aug. 1911). An immense amount of *out-of-the-way* material is gathered together in Mr. Bell's "Shakespeare's Puck and Folklore". (A. Nutt: The Fairy Mythology of Shakespeare p. 38). — *Colzafield*. Colza is the French name of cole-seed (N. E. D.) Rape, coleseed, or colza is a crop largely grown as sheepfood, sometimes combined with mustard. Bees in Drenthe... taken to travel in carts during the summer season by all the flowering *colzafields*. (May Crommelin: Brown Eyes IX, 97). — Strictly speaking to

*browse* is to feed on the leaves and shoots of trees and bushes; the term is sometimes carelessly used for *graze*, but properly implies the cropping of scanty vegetation. (N.E.D.) The Progressive Form might have been used: From that southward terrace you looked across a mile or two of hollow bottom, with a little lake at your feet, to sloping pastures where *there were cattle browsing*. (J. M. Forman: *The Blind Spot*. Ch. I. p. 9). "There is no lion anywhere hereabouts", he said, "because the game *are grazing peacefully*" (G. H. Scull: *Hunting Big Game with Lasso and Camera*).

2. *Here of all places*. Making between £ 500 and £ 600 a year on a fruitfarm in — *of all places* — Rhodesia (Katherine Mansfield, *Garden Party* p. 129). Who had so strangely dropped out of our lives. In Tonga *Isles of all places* (Strand Magazine Feb. 1923 p. 187). London *of all cities* in the world calls for an intelligent handbook. Why did he use this gun *of all weapons*? (Conan Doyle: *Valley of Fear*). And yet at first sight it does seem that his (Flaubert's) manner of arriving at his subject — if his subject is Emma Bovary — is considerably casual. He begins with Charles, *of all people* — Charles, her husband, the stupid soul . . . . (P. Lubbock: *The Art of Fiction* p. 77). — *Cottage*. The dictionaries tell us that a *cottage* is "a labourer's or villager's small dwelling"; we should certainly expect to find it inhabited by an employee rather than by an employer. But a point often forgotten is that the oldest, and probably the most picturesque English cottages were not built for labourers at all. ("We meet with many small buildings, or remains of larger erections, now inhabited by the agricultural labourer, but in nearly all cases it will be found that the houses had originally been tenanted by those whose social position was far higher". [Turner and Parker's *Domestic Architecture* III. p. 22]). The old legal definition of a cottage gives us considerably less scope in considering what a cottage is, for we are told (Blount's *Law Dictionary*) that "by a statute 1 Eliz. Cap. 7. no man may build a house unless he lay 4 acres of land to it; so that a cottage is properly any little house that has not four acres of land belonging to it". The amount of accommodation considered necessary has altered very largely in the last three centuries and the result has been that many moderately-sized houses have been subdivided into two or more tenements, and the "row" of two or three old cottages which we often admire was originally one long farmhouse. — *Flat- Level- Even- Smooth*. According to Crabb *flat* is said of a thing with regard to itself, *level* as it respects other things so that we speak of "flat feet" and "a room *level* with the street". With regard to the surface of land *flat* is a depreciative word, indicating lowness or unattractiveness, or both; *level* conveys no slur, and is entirely consistent with beauty: *flat* marshes — *level* prairies. That which is *flat* or *level* is parallel to the horizon; that which is *even* is free from inequalities, as an *even* slope. *Smooth* refers to a surface so uniform that the eye and the touch do not readily detect any projections or irregularities in it. A *smooth-haired* foxterrier (opposed to a *wire-haired* dog). All jagged edges should be filed or hammered *smooth*.

3. *At the back of the garden*. The Oxford Dictionary defines 'on the farther side of' (Back 5) and close behind (Back 23). The dining room was *at the back* of the house [achterin; aan den achterkant] (Strand Magazine Dec. 1910. p. 827). As for eyes you want them *at the back* of your head. (Sidgwick: *Lanternbearers* p. 126). *Behind the garden* is less ambiguous: It was a quaint old timbered house, little bigger than a cottage, with a thatched roof, and *behind* it some outbuildings, a small orchard, and a field of a dozen acres. (W. H. Hudson: *A Shepherd's Life* Ch. XXII). — *An*



*orchard was lying* unenglish. The Progressive Form should not be used of actions or states that are of unlimited duration. It would be contrary to English usage to say or write: The statue of Erasmus *is standing* in the marketplace, but it is good English to say 'the boy *is standing* on his head'. (limited duration). — *In the midst (centre) of a dance.* *Centre* and *Middle* are often wrongly used interchangeably. To part hair in the *centre* is very different from parting it in the *middle* of one's head. *In the midst of* is used chiefly in the senses: Among, amid, surrounded by (a number of things or persons); while fully engaged with, "in the thick of" (occupations, troubles etc.); during the continuance of (an action or condition) (N. E. D.): Christian seek not yet repose, Hear thy guardian angel say: Thou art *in the midst* of foes, Watch and pray. (Church Hymnary). *In the midst* of this occupation and the pandemonium raised by the marching soldiers he gradually became conscious that someone was calling him by name (Strand Magazine July 1914. p. 45). This expectation of discovering regularity *in the midst* of confusion is so familiar to scientific men that it becomes an article of faith. (Buckle: History of Civilization I. p. 6). *In the midst* of a maelstrom of noises. (Illustr. London News Oct. 16. '09), To speak to the schoolmistress *in the midst* of all her scholars. (Edgeworth: Moral Tales.). *In the midst* of his bewilderment the man in the cocked hat demanded who he was. (Rip van Winkle.). A great giant, ...lived in a castle *in the midst* of a forest. (Books for the Bairns no 4. p. 28.). *In the midst* of their fantasia they heard the hollow thud of a camel. (Strand Magazine June 1909. p. 672.). The *middle* is that part of a substance which is at an equal distance from both its ends. *Midst* is that point which is at an equal distance from all parts of its circumference. The *middle* of June is half-way between the beginning and the end of the month. The *midst* of a forest is that part which is at an equal distance from all parts of its circumference. In an abstract sense *midst* is more frequently used: *In the midst* of life we are in death.

4. *Attached to the wall* is correct. *Nailed at the wall* is not; compare the phrase 'to nail one's colours to the mast'. — *Affirm* is less suitable, its usual meaning being 'to declare or state emphatically'. Demand to be led before the king. *Affirm* that thou hast received a sovereign medicine (R. Garnett: Ananda). The magistrate must allow the atheist to *affirm* instead of to swear (G. B. Shaw: Getting Married.). — *Information* is never found in the plural. — *Agent - Factor - Broker*. The first is the most general term: person employed or appointed to act for another, called the principal [= lastgever]. A mercantile agent, commonly called simply 'agent', is one to whom authority is given to sell, buy, or consign goods for sale or to raise money on security of goods. Buying-agent: selling-agent; commission-agent [= *commissiennair*]; general agent [= *hoofdagent*]; sole agent [= *alleenvertegenwoordiger*]; shipping-agent [= *expediteur*]; house- (and estate) agent. *Factor*: An agent who professionally buys or sells goods for another, but carries on the business in his own name, and not in the name of his principal. In modern practice = commission agent. Cheesefactor, coalfactor, cornfactor, hopfactor, woolfactor. The law with respect to factors has been codified by a statute passed in 1889, called the *Factors Act*. *Broker*: An agent who professionally buys or sells goods, shares etc., for a principal on commission, without having possession of them, and not for his own account. Bill-broker [= *wisselmakelaar*]; stockbroker [= *effectenmakelaar*]; insurance-broker [= *makelaar in assurantiën*]; shipbroker [= *cargadoor*]. —

5. *In order to look it over* is correct.

6. *I was standing on the doorstep* is correct: But as *I was standing* on the steps of my club, preparatory to calling on Muriel, it struck me that it would be wise to propitiate her by a gift. (Frank Richardson: The Bayswater Miracle). *I stood* on the bridge at midnight, As the clocks were striking the hour (Longfellow). — *Pull (at) the bell-rope*: Again Leon *pulled* the bell-rope; again the solemn tocsin awoke the echoes of the inn. (R. L. Stevenson: Providence and the Guitar.). The conductor cried "All full" and *tugged* at his bell-strap. (Morrison: Tales of Mean Streets). I and some other ladies were *pulling* at some short lengths — you know what those summer-sales are, and how excited people naturally get. (Frank Richardson: Bayswater Miracle p. 106.). *A cord with tuft*. *Tuft*, according to the N. E. D. is a bunch (natural or artificial) of small things, usually *soft and flexible*, as hairs, feathers etc., fixed or attached at the base. The term *tuft-hunting* took its rise at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, where the young noblemen wore a peculiarly formed cap with a *tuft*. A *tuft-hunter* is a hanger-on to persons of nobility, who submits to the insolence of the great for the sake of the supposed honour of being in their company. Cleaned out the frying-pan with a *tuft* of grass (Three Men in a Boat.). Eyes which lurked in deep hollows under overhung and *tufted* eyebrows. (Strand Magazine July 1904. p. 410.). He is not a bit of a *tuft-hunter*; he is less of a toady. (Locker Lampson, Confidences. p. 352.).

7. *The noise would travel far*. *Noise* is hardly the right word to apply to the sound made by a bell, it is especially said of discordant, harsh, or disagreeable sounds. Sound *carries* better with the wind than against it (Everyman Encyclopaedia i.v. Sound.). The *noise* of men at-arms making merry over supper within came forth in fits and was swallowed up and carried away by the wind. (R. L. Stevenson: The Sire de Malétoit's Door.).

8. *A cottage that was lying* should be that *was situated* or *lay*, the Progressive Form not being usual when unlimited duration is implied.

9. *Emerged from the house* is correct. The word seems to be restricted to the literary language, as appears from the following dialogue which took place at Clerkenwell Police Court on Aug 1. 1924: Police-sergeant (giving evidence): "I saw the prisoner *emerge*". Mr. Waddy (magistrate): "*Come out*, I suppose that means?" Sergeant: "Yes". Mr. Waddy: "Let's be plain". — *The man with corduroys*. Very often English idiom requires *in* where Dutch usage requires *met*: It was the picture of a fellow *in* a high Spanish hat. (Wilkie Collins: The Traveller's Story.). A gentleman *in* a white waistcoat (Dickens: Oliver Twist.). A man *in* a wig (*with* a beard!). — *The heavy gait peculiar of peasants* should be *peculiar to* (characteristic, typical of). *Pace* does not refer to the manner of walking: Wildevé walked a *pace* or two among the heather. (Hardy: Return of the Native I. 130.). When one has been in a pitched battle and a dozen raids . . . , a certain swagger in the *gait* is surely to be pardoned. (R. L. Stevenson: Sire de Malétoit's Door.).

10. *That I came to view their house*. Converting this into direct speech we get: "I *come* to view your house". In reality the action is past, but at the same time present (through its result) so that the perfect is required. See Sweet N. E. G. § 275: "The perfect combines past and present time: thus *I have come to see you* combines the two ideas: "I came here" and "I am here now". *I have come* to look after you a little. (Henry James: Owen Wingrave IV.). All the same the present tense is occasionally met with in cases like the one under discussion: I (have) come to pay the rent.

11. *That he should send them word.* The agent had said: "I will send you word" (a promise).

12. *Confused- Confounded- Embarrassed.* *Confused* does not express so high a degree of disorder as *confounded*. One who is confused still retains his senses to a certain degree; he who is confounded is in the highest state of stupefaction, and no longer knows what he is doing. A criminal is confounded at the discovery of his guilt; liars are confused when suspected (Graham.) *Embarrassed* expresses perplexity (in thought) or constraint (in manner or behaviour.). A small and nervous boy came one day with a message into the Sixth Form room. 'Please Sir', said he, 'Guts says....' and the rest was lost in laughter. Sidgwick (the master) quietly went to him, received the message, and sent the boy off, saying, as the door was shut behind him, 'Poor little man, he was rather *confused*'. A mere pedagogue would have thundered. (Times Weekly 8. 8. 1920.). They were *embarrassed*. It was as if somebody had said something indecent (J. M. Forman: The Blind Spot. Ch. II. 34.)

13. *Exchanged anxious glances (with each other).* As in Dutch *met elkaar* need not be expressed. Observe that the reciprocal pronoun is occasionally dispensed with in English where our language requires it: Our letters must have crossed. See Kruisinga's Handbook § 1872.

14. *Fumble- Twitch- Work.* He spoke with an automatic sort of emphasis, his eyes wandering, and his hands *twitching* nervously (Gissing: Christopher.). The *twitching* lips betokened a gnawing fear. (Strand Magazine July 1911. p. 27.). Those who saw him with *twitching* hands, a puffy face, and flickering eyelids drew their own conclusions. (Hutchinson's Magazine, March 1920. p. 237.). Her lips were *twitching* and her eyes were ablaze (Strand Magazine 1909. p. 685.). What are you *fumbling* at it for in this highly suspicious manner? (Anstey: Vice Versa.). He bent and *fumbled* and with a few turns of the spanner loosened the joint of the exhaust-pipe (Strand Magazine Dec. 1906. p. 714.). Her face *worked* ("Pam" p. 23). There was hate in their eyes and in their *working* mouths. (Strand Magazine Jan. 1915. p. 96.)

15. *Surely* your wife knew? (Strand Magazine Dec. 1904. p. 603). *Surely* Viola can bind herself by no vows. (Conway: Slings and Arrows, p. 83.). You're not meaning the Prime Minister again *surely*? (Hall Caine: The Christian).

16. *I gathered from his words.* I gather from a letter just to hand that you are actually sending me a piano (Pearson Magazine, Feb. 1910. p. 211.).

17. *By all means* is used to emphasize a permission, request or injunction = certainly (N. E. D.). Punish the thief *by all means* but first recover the stolen property (Morrison: Red Triangle.). Take the book (you asked me) *by all means*. (Strand Magazine Dec. 1910.). "If you get the billet may I ask what's the matter with him?" "*By all means*, when you've got the billet". (Hornung: Raffles.).

18. *Prepare to:* Miss G. entering a full tramcar as Jorkins *prepares to rise*: "Please keep your seat". (Royal Magazine, March 1912.).

19. *Has the house been let.* See Onions, Advanced Syntax § 116.

Good translations were received from Mr. A. B., Texel; Miss A. H., Amsterdam; Mr. A. T. de M., Amsterdam; Miss M. P., Utrecht; Miss H. W. S., Rotterdam; Mr. P. W. K. Z., 's-Gravenhage.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 94 Voorstraat, Brielle, before October 20<sup>th</sup>. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.



Daar was ook de vrees voor armoede.

Het was eerst Juli, maar toch was nu al de vrees voor armoede, die gewoonlijk tegen den winter eerst kwam.

De diakenen, als zij vergadering hadden, ontveinsden zich den toestand niet, zooals die komen zou in den winter, en namen maatregelen van bezuiniging; maar hoe konden zij nu bezuinigen, nu, terwijl de nood reeds aan den man was?

Kieft, die nog nooit van de diaconie had getrokken, had op de vergadering van diakenen met de pet in de hand gestaan, bij de deur, totdat de diakenen gezegd hadden, dat hij naar voren moest komen; en toen had hij maar naar den grond gezien, als iemand, die een misdaad ging doen; en de diakenen hadden hem gezegd, dat hij niet behoefde te spreken, zij wisten het alles. Ook behoefde hij zich niet te schamen, want wie kon zeggen of zij, de diakenen, zelven niet nog dit jaar in hetzelfde geval zouden komen? Dat had Kieft vertroost; en het was hem geweest, of door de goedheid der broeders hem de schande was ontnomen.

Maar zoo begon de armoede al.

Na Kieft was er niemand meer geweest, maar de broeders begrepen dat zij ongevraagd moesten binnenkomen bij sommigen en geven; want wie zou zooals Kieft nog meer de vernedering willen dragen? Zoo gingen de diakenen geven, terwijl zij hadden moeten bezuinigen. In den angst voor wat nog meer komen kon, spraken de menschen met elkander, als zij van de kerk naar huis wandelden; er werd over de preek gesproken, in verband met den nood, die aankwam. Als er in de preek iets was voorgekomen, dat er op betrekking had, dan werd dit aangehaald en behandeld, al loopende, maar zij gingen en spraken als slaapwandelaars. Wanneer er drie, vier menschen bij de brug bij elkander stonden staken zij de hoofden bijeen; maar vier wisten evenmin raad als een.

Toen werd er voorgesteld een biddag te houden. Wie had er het eerst over gesproken? Niemand wist het. Zij hadden er in den herberg van Sieds over gesproken en in den gemeenteraad voor de vergadering begon. Wie kon zeggen, wie het eerst erover begonnen was?

Maar op zekeren dag gebeurde er iets, dat de menschen van de Hervormde Kerk met een grooten eerbied voor hun dominee vervulde. Zij hadden Walter zijn huis zien uitgaan, en regelrecht naar den pastorie van Senserff zien trekken; zij hadden hem zien aanbellen en binnengaan. Den volgende Zondag wist het de geheele gemeente, want van beide kansen werd met goedvinden van de beide Kerkeraden afgekondigd, dat er op den aanstaanden Woensdag een biddag zou gehouden worden door al het volk, zoowel Hervormd als Doleerend; en dat in beide kerken tegelijk godsdienstoefening zou zijn.

### Translation M. O. 1924

Lord Stanhope was even zonderling als zijn dochter. Hij sliep bij open ramen onder twaalf dekens, ontbeet met een stuk bruin brood en liet het wapen van zijn koets wegnemen, omdat hij het te aristocratisch vond. Naar de opvoeding zijner kinderen keek hij niet om. Dat deed evenmin de tweede Lady Stanhope, die na den vroegtijdigen dood der eerste een moeder voor de weezen had moeten zijn. Maar zij had het te druk met haar opera's en bals. Zoo groeiden de kinderen op. Vooral voor de oudste, Esther, geboren in zeventien honderd zes en zeventig, ware verstandige, zorgvuldige leiding zeer gewenscht geweest. Het was een levendig, gezond meisje, luidruchtig, excentriek en ongehoorzaam. Haar kracht en haar onafhankelijkheid wekten het vertrouwen van haar oom, den beroemden minister Pitt, zoodat deze niet aarzelde aan haar, een achttienjarig meisje, de leiding van zijn huis toe te vertrouwen.

Zoo trad zij in de groote wereld. Een indrukwekkende gastvrouw met haar hooge gestalte van zes voet. Zij was noch beminnelijk, noch mooi en ontzag niemand en niets. Alleen voor Brummel, den koning der dandy's, had zij een zekere achting, omdat hij, de man zonder voorvaders, zoovele adellijke bewonderaars tot blinde gehoorzaamheid aan zijn onzinnige grillen wist te dwingen. Zij werd gevreesd en gehaat, maar toch gevleid, want haar invloed was groot. Haar oom liet haar begaan en zij benoemde of ontsloeg militairen en civiele ambtenaren.

Haar oom stierf in achttienhonderd zes en nu was haar invloed spoedig uit. Vol verachting voor de wereld trok zij zich naar Wales terug. Toen een paar jaar later haar liefste broeder haar door den dood ontviel, zeide zij de Engelsche maatschappij vaarwel. Met een klein gevolg reisde zij door Griekenland en Egypte, bezocht Jeruzalem, trok door de woestijn en vestigde zich op een bergtop in Syrië. Onrustiger woonplaats had zij niet kunnen kiezen dan dit land met zijn hevige twisten en bloedige veeten tusschen Arabieren en Turken. Toch liep zij geen oogenblik gevaar. Zij liet op den berg een kasteel bouwen, met een middeleeuwschen muur omgeven. Haar dertig inlandsche bedienden, mannen zoowel als vrouwen, regeerde zij met ijzeren hand. Zij zond kameelen

beladen met koren, vijgen en kleeren naar de dorpen. Zij bestudeerde den Oosterschen geest om haar heen en haar geloof onderging den invloed daarvan, het werd een vreemd mengsel van Westersche en Oostersche begrippen en bijgeloovigheden.

Eindelijk werd zij ziek. Een Engelsch consul uit de buurt, die van haar ziekte hoorde, ging met een Amerikaanschen zendeling te paard naar haar toe. Zij kwamen aan, toen zij juist gestorven was.

Zoo stierf de vrouw, die door haar zonderlingheid en hoogmoed de aandacht van geheel Europa had getrokken.

Lord Stanhope was as peculiar as his daughter. He slept with open windows, under twelve blankets, breakfasted on a piece of brown bread and had his crest removed from his coach, because he thought it too aristocratic. He did not in the least trouble about the education of his children. Nor did the second Lady Stanhope, who, after the early death of the first, ought to have been a mother to the orphans. But she was too busy with her operas and balls. Thus the children grew up. Especially for the eldest, Esther, born in seventeen hundred and seventy-six, wise and careful guidance would have been highly desirable. She was a lively, healthy girl, boisterous, eccentric and disobedient. Her strength and her independence inspired her uncle, the famous minister Pitt, with confidence, so that he did not hesitate to entrust her, a girl of eighteen years old, with the management of his house.

Thus she entered society. An imposing hostess with her tall stature of six feet. She was neither amiable, nor handsome, and spared nobody and nothing. For Brummel alone, the king of the dandies, she had a certain esteem, because he, the man without ancestors, knew how to compel so many noble admirers to obedience to his foolish whims. She was feared and hated, but yet flattered, for her influence was great. Her uncle gave her a free hand in everything, and she appointed and dismissed military and civil officers.

Her uncle died in eighteen hundred and six, and now her influence was soon gone. Full of contempt of the world she retired to Wales. When, a few years afterwards, she lost her dearest brother by death, she bade farewell to English society. With a small retinue she travelled through Greece and Egypt, visited Jerusalem, crossed the desert and settled on a mountain-top in Syria. She could not have chosen a more unquiet dwelling-place than this country with its violent quarrels and bloody feuds between Arabs and Turks. Yet she was not a moment in danger. She had a castle built on the mountain, surrounded by a mediæval wall. Her thirty native servants, both men and women, she ruled with an iron hand. She sent camels loaded with corn, figs and clothes, to the villages. She studied the Eastern spirit about her, and her faith was influenced by it, it became a strange blend of Western and Eastern notions and superstitions.

At last she fell ill. An English consul from the neighbourhood, who heard of her illness, went to her on horseback with an American missionary. They arrived when she had just died.

Thus died the woman who, by her eccentricity and haughtiness, had drawn the attention of all Europe.

## Points of Modern English Syntax.

141. Amid the rustles which denoted her to be undressing in the darkness other heavy breaths frequently came. Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I, ch. 6.

What part of the sentence is *her*? Hdbk. 489.

142. The sloping stroke through the tail of the *p* — forming the contraction for *per* — might be disregarded by the scribe, or might help the *p* to look more like *z*. Correspondent in *Times Lit. S.* 12/6, 24.

What construction is here used after *help*? Hdbk. 490.

143. A traveller who should walk and observe any of these visitants as Venn observed them now could feel himself to be in direct communication with regions unknown to man. Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I, ch. 10.

What is the function of *should*? Hdbk. 420. When is *to feel* construed with an accusative - and - infinitive with *to*? Hdbk. 557.

144. It had waited thus, unmoved, during so many centuries, through the crises of so many things, that it could only be imagined to await one last crisis — the final overthrow. *ib.* I, ch. 1.

What is the construction with *to imagine*? Hdbk. 502.

145. I have decided that the best plan will be for you to be sent somewhere by me, to make a real thing of the excuse. *ib.* II, ch. 4.

What is the function of *for you*? Hdbk. 540, 3.

146. They omit to consider what poetry is. Abercrombie, *The Epic*, p. 24.

Can *to consider* be replaced by another verbal form? Hdbk. 661.

147. (These activities) set the surrounding rabbits curiously watching from hillocks at a safe distance. Hardy, *Return of the Native*, II, ch. 1.

What is the construction after *to set*? Hdbk. 694.

148. I do not wish to show myself beaten before all Egdon. *ib.* II, ch. 2.

Is *myself* an object? Hdbk. 697.

149. Accordingly, when watching on the night after the festival, the reddleman saw him ascend by the little path, lean over the front gate of Clym's garden, sigh, and turn to go back again. *ib.* IV, ch. 4.

Would the accusative - and - present participle be equally possible here? If not, why not? Hdbk. 704.

150. It would be a very idle piece of work, to choose between the potency of Homer's genius and of Milton's. Abercrombie, *Epic*, p. 25.

Strange that such a piece of idling should have seemed an important errand. Hardy, *Return of the Native*, II, ch. 1.

What is the function of *piece* in these two sentences? Hdbk. 868.

151. A night of happy augury to Father and Son. They were looking out for the same thing; only one employed science, the other instinct; and which hit upon the right it was for time to decide. Meredith, *Richard Feverel*, 1st ed. reprinted Memorial ed. vol. 27, p. 84.

What is unusual about the use of *which*? Hdbk. 1155c.

152. "Where has he been living all these years?"

"In that rookery of pomp and vanity, Paris, I believe." Hardy, *Return of the Native*, I, ch. 11.

What is the function of *that*? Hdbk. 1185.

153. To do things musingly, and by small degrees, seemed, indeed, to be a duty in the Egdon valleys at this transitional hour, for there is that in the condition of the heath itself which resembled protracted and halting dubiousness. *ib.* I, ch. 2.

What is the function of *that*? Hdbk. 1190.

154. As far as there can be said to have been any leader at the beginning of the Oxford movement, he was the man. Wakeman, *History of the Church of England* p. 456.

What is the function of the article before *man*? Hdbk. 1227.

155. Mr. Oak carried about him, by way of watch, what may be called a small silver clock. Hardy, *Far from the Madding Crowd*, ch. 1.

Why would it be impossible to use an article before *way*, even though it is followed by an *of*-adjunct? Hdbk. 1265. — And what is the cause of the absence of the article before *watch*? Hdbk. 1269.

156. It was a fine and quiet afternoon, about three o'clock; but the winter solstice having stealthily come on, the lowness of the sun caused the hour to seem later than it actually was, there being little here to remind an inhabitant that he must unlearn his summer experience of the sky as a dial. *Return of the Native*, II, ch. 1.

What is the function of *there* before *being*? Hdbk. 722. — What is the function of the prefix *un-* in *unlearn*? Hdbk. 1685.



157. Eustacia was indoors in the dining-room, which was really more like a kitchen, having a stone floor and a gaping chimney-corner. Hardy, *ib.* II, ch. 1.

Could the relative clause be replaced by a participle-construction? Compare Hdbk. 717.

158. You have found him not to be the saint you thought him. *ib.* II, ch. 2.

What is the relation between *the saint* and the adjective clause? The case should be added to Hdbk. 1933.

159. He heard with a recurrence of the slight jealousy he had always felt of Stella that, though she was not yet eleven years old, . . . *Sinister Street*, p. 159.

What is peculiar about the words of *Stella*? Hdbk. 2130.

160. Owing to limitations of space I have had to leave out many ideas or principles that I should have liked to touch upon. Sapir, *Language*, p. IV.

What part of speech is *owing*? Hdbk. 730.

---

## Reviews.

*An Elementary Middle English Grammar.* By JOSEPH WRIGHT and ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1923. 214 pp. 7s. net.

When I was at Oxford at the end of last century I was asked by a Scotchman who had taken his degree at a Scotch university and wanted to do what is now perhaps called research work, what book was to be recommended for Middle English. I showed him Ten Brink's book, but he told me it was no good to him: he did not know German! I am not sure that things are really better in this respect at present, in spite of Professor Wyld's advice in his *Short History*: "It may seem paradoxical, but it is true that the first and most necessary preparation for the modern study of the history of the English language is a knowledge of German."

The little book which Prof. and Mrs. Wright here offer to the English public will not relieve real students from this irksome task; but beginners will at least have a book on which to start, and many who only study Middle English for literary purposes will not need further help. And even those who are not handicapped by ignorance of German will gladly turn to this book, for which there is no German equivalent. It is true that a beginner may take Professor Luick's authoritative book, ignoring the small print; but it is to be feared that a student of English has so many things to do in the short time he can spend at the university that some other part of his work (e.g. the living language, or literature) would suffer. In Holland at any rate, where a great deal of time must be spent on the practical as well as the theoretical study of Present English, this book will be looked upon by students as a real boon.

The authors of this book do not claim to have new discoveries to offer, and acknowledge their indebtedness to the scholars who have made it possible: Morsbach, Luick, Ten Brink, and Björkman. It is natural, however, to expect some personal note even in an elementary book, if written by a real scholar. Fortunately this personal element is not wanting here: I consider as such the emphasis laid on the utilization of modern dialects in the interpretation of Middle English spellings. The authors also point out how much more would have been possible if we possessed a "comprehensive

atlas of the modern dialects such as has been produced by France and Germany of their dialects."

The book falls into two parts dealing with sounds and inflections respectively. It is usual for grammars to treat syntax as if it were of no importance, but for an elementary book this seems to us a grave mistake. It is not only that information is withheld from the student that he cannot do without, but it is of even greater importance that he is thus encouraged to think that in matters syntactical there is nothing to be learned or observed. The student who turns to Middle English texts, and that is of course what this book should help him to do, is sure to fall into traps if he tries to manage without syntax. -- The first chapter deals with Orthography and Pronunciation separately. We are afraid that the first part of this chapter will prove absolutely unintelligible to a student who has not mastered the rest of the Phonology. It is sufficient to look at the frequent forward references to be convinced of this. The authors would also have made things easier for the reader if they had consistently distinguished spelling and sound. We advise students to skip this chapter and take the second and third chapters before it. The second chapter enumerates some OE. vowel-changes which are of special importance for M.E. One change is not mentioned: that of *e* into *i* before *-ht*, as in the forms preceding M.E. *niht*, *miht*, *mihte*. The result is that the student will not understand the statement in § 46 about "Late OE *i*, of whatever origin". I do not understand what is meant by the remark in § 30: "The common form *fiȝten* was a ME. new formation." -- The next chapters deal with unaccented vowels and with the French and Scandinavian loanwords. The chapter on the Consonants is as systematic as the others: a more practical method would have been to omit what is here said about consonants that "have remained unchanged". -- In the chapter on Nouns the words are grouped according to the Primitive Germanic stems (vocalic stems, etc.). It would perhaps give a better idea of the facts of ME. if the division had been in ME. consonant-stems (*ston*, *engel*, *hand*) and *e*-stems (*ende*, *sone*, *tale*, *asse*). Of course each of these would have to be sub-divided according to gender, and the nouns that take *-n* in the plural would still have to form a separate class. The unduly historical character of the arrangement adopted here causes *schroud* to appear as a class by itself, although it "was declined like an ordinary old neuter *a*-stem", i. e. what I have called a consonant-stem above (like *ston*). -- The relative *that* is explained as a development of the demonstrative; see in the present number of this periodical p. 141. In § 365 it might have been mentioned that the old numeral *other* was replaced by the foreign *second*, because *other* had come to mean "different". -- Two more details may be referred to. In § 181 the pronunciation *ju* for *educate* instead of *i*, is ascribed to Central French in contrast to Norman French. Is it not a simple case of spelling-pronunciation? -- In § 251 examples are given of the development of glide-consonants in Modern English. Is the introduction of *p* into *empty* more than a matter of spelling? And is not the Oxford Dictionary explanation of *-t* in *against* and *biheste* as due to analogy (compare *betwixt*, *amidst*, and superlatives for the first, nouns like *ishefte*, *wiste*, *sighte*, *pefte* for the second) to be preferred to the phonetic explanation suggested by the authors?

E. KRUSINGA.

*Westeuropeesche Letterkunde*. Door Dr. G. KALFF, in leven hoogleeraar aan de Rijks-Universiteit te Leiden. Tweede deel: Hervorming en Renaissance. Uitgegeven en vermeerderd met een levensbericht en bibliographie door Dr. G. Kalff Jr. Wolters, 1924. VI + 241 + CXXXVI. Geb. f 8.25.

The first part of *Westeuropeesche Letterkunde*, published in the author's lifetime, was reviewed in E.S. VI, 1 (February 1924). After his death, the greater part of the second volume was found existing in M.S., and this has now been published, and to some extent edited, by his son. No further parts are to follow, as no other scholar could be found able and willing to carry on the work on similar lines.

In point of general estimate, there is little to be added to the opinion expressed on the first volume. Specialists in any one European literature will read it for what the author has to say on the other subjects rather than on their own. I will therefore confine myself to pointing out some details regarding English literature.

On p. 5 *Martin Marprelate's Epistle* is mentioned in the same breath with anti-catholic Reformation literature. This may be confusing to some readers. — The wording of a sentence on p. 6 is misleading: „Bale's *Kynge Johan*, a<sup>o</sup> 1539 in het paleis van aartsbisschop Cranmer vertoond . . . prijst Koningin Elisabeth . . .” An interlude concerning King John *was* performed in 1539, but it seems uncertain whether this was Bale's. After the accession of Elizabeth Bale's play was revised. [Cf. Tucker Brooke, *Tudor Drama*, p. 130]. At any rate, the mention of the year 1539 and Queen Elizabeth in the same sentence is liable to misunderstanding by any reader not well-versed in English history. — On p. 7 the morality *New Custom* is dated (c. 1570), on pp. 32 and 38 (1573.). Why not be exact and say *printed* 1573? — P. 117. Among translations and imitations of Italian novels no English titles are given. — P. 126. No English works are mentioned among histories and chronicles. — P. 185. Young's translation of Montemayor's *Diana*, if published in 1583, can hardly have been of much use to Sidney, as by that date even the revised version of *Arcadia* was probably written. We have to assume that he used an earlier edition, e.g. the Antwerp one of 1575. — P. 187. *Zelmana* should be *Zelmane*. — P. 200. Landmann's thesis that Euphuism is an imitation of the style of the Spaniard de Guevara, long since disposed of by Feuillerat (*John Lyly*, 1910) and rejected by the *Cambridge History*, is here repeated. This shows the danger of venturing on ground not perfectly familiar. — P. 227. D'Urfé's *Astrée* is wrongly said to be the first work showing the influence of the Greek novel, but on p. 185 the *Aethiopica* is — rightly — mentioned among the models of Sidney's *Arcadia*. If the author had been able to see his work through the press, such details would probably not have escaped his attention. — P. 229. The alternation of prose with sonnets and madrigals in Greene's *Menaphon* is not „in Euphuistischen trant”, but shows influence of *Arcadia*. — P. 230. Iamblichus' *Babylonica* (not *Babyloniaca*) was not printed until 1601, and can therefore hardly have exerted much influence in the sixteenth century. — P. 237. When in a discussion of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1605) Juan de Valdes, friend to Erasmus, is called „een der fijnste geesten van dien tijd”, this is perhaps covered by my suggestion as to p. 227.

The biography by the author's son is interesting and well-written, although the exposition of the biographer's own views on certain questions on which he finds himself in disagreement with his father, is surely supererogatory. A keener eye on some of the proof-sheets would have been more to the purpose.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.



*Shelley's geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung.* Von THEODOR SPIRA.  
Giessener Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache und Kultur Englands  
und Nordamerikas, herausgegeben von W. Horn. 1923. (92 pages).

This booklet treats of the share taken by Shelley in the "Menschheitsaufgabe" of his time.

No work on Shelley has come to perfect clearness about the ultimate importance of the spiritual message that this poet has brought. It is important to know not only what an age actually produced, what innovations it carried through, but also what theories, what aspirations lay at the bottom of these manifestations. The author quotes Goethe's words: „Ist es doch eine höchst wunderliche Forderung, die wohl manchmal gemacht: Erfahrungen solle man ohne irgend ein theoretisches Band vortragen und dem Leser, dem Schüler überlassen, sich selbst nach Belieben eine Überzeugung zu bilden. Denn das bloße Ansehen einer Sache kann uns nicht fördern. Jedes Ansehen geht über in ein Betrachten, jedes Betrachten in ein Sinnen, jedes Sinnen in ein Verknüpfen"....

It is often thought that Shelley considered his moral teaching more important than his poetry itself. This is not true; didactic poetry, he says is, his horror. His moral convictions and the poetical shape they took are one and indivisible.

It is interesting to follow the poet's development in his critical works; his atheism, then his Godwin worship, his Platonism, his moral independence. The critical introductions added to his poems are inseparable parts of them; they cannot be ignored by any one who wishes to grasp Shelley's moral views in their full significance.

Mr. Spira gives an analysis of *The Defense of Poetry*, Shelley's most elaborate critical work. What is the cause, Shelley asks, that so little active good has remained of the noble teachings of prophets? It is because what came from the soul (and was *poetry*) has been taken in and assimilated by *reason*. Thought and word have been confused. Not before the 11<sup>th</sup> century did the inner meaning of Christ's teachings work some good.

Shelley unhesitatingly places poetry (the faculty of the imagination) in its highest meaning above the faculty of the mind. But the question suggests itself whether poetry also deserves the first place as a useful influence in ordinary life? If joy in its highest sense, restful happiness, not the joy that comes and goes with our daily experiences, is a worthy aim of life, we must own that poetry, which is the direct and true expression of truth, will help to turn the mind away from the apparent truths which are the cause of the restlessness we experience in life. The pure expression of truth will impress itself on the mind, the actions, the whole being of those who are willing to listen to it. This joy in its highest sense seems to us to be linked with and due to suffering; but, in Shelley's view, this is caused by the inexplicable want of harmony in man. For Shelley is convinced that pure joy can exist independently of its opposite; that evil is not inherent in the created world, but an accidental thing that can be expelled. His favourite hero is he who conquers evil.

In the history of the world the calculating faculty, when not enlightened by the faculty of imagination, has always led to a greater distance between luxury on one side and want on the other. We can imagine the world without Locke and Hume, not without Dante and Shakespeare. The reason why the world advances so slowly is that we want the poet's faculty to feel, and shape into a powerful image, what we know intellectually. Never is the cultivation of poetry more desirable

than at times when *self* reigns supreme, for then a barrier rises between man's inner feelings and his conscious perceptions. But even the poet does not hear the inner voice continuously; nor can he ever give it adequate expression; for when he begins to put his feelings into words, inspiration is already on the wane and the poem is only a feeble echo of a rich and mighty sound.

The author shows how Shelley consciously becomes a worker in the spiritual movement of his day. He strives after freedom, the freedom which is love (Masque of Anarchy). A loosening of false bonds is necessary to attain to this freedom. He shook off the shackles of Christianity, not because he denied the existence of a God but because of the attributes that had come to be associated with God (cf. Goethe's letter to Herder: „Wenn nur die Ganze Lehre von Christo nicht so ein Scheinding wäre, das mich . . . rasend macht"). All dogma is an *image* and "the deep truth is imageless". Christ's teachings have been misunderstood and have degenerated into a form of culture that has travelled far away from the essence of those teachings.

In *The Triumph of Life*, Rousseau appears to the poet; the man who "feared, loved, hated, suffered, did and died" could not himself go the road which "the spark with which Heaven lit his spirit" allowed him to see; but he saw that *in* man all promise for a new life is held.

Shelley was one of those who heard the music of the spheres; who felt that all earthly things are linked as inferior parts to a higher order of things. All the "men divine who rose like shadows between man and God" did bad work, for they prevented man from seeing the true sun; and even now we are worshipping the eclipse. (*Triumph of Life*, l. 289 ff.) The coming of the new era in which there will be no sin, no illness, no death, is the great theme of his works. But it must come from within, and the thought that is thought, not the deed that is done, determines the state of the world". "Who hates his brother is his murderer". The new era can only come carried by the inner disposition of all.

Browning thought that Shelley, if he had lived longer, would have come to consider himself a Christian. There is nothing in Shelley's works that corroborates this view. He wants to feel as purely as possible what binds him to God; "no man cometh unto the Father, but by me" was not said for him.

The author says that only by tracing the leading thought of all Shelley's utterances can we get an insight into the poet's message. He had a notion of the spiritual world which ours touches. "Er gehört zu den Menschen, deren Erdensein uns innewerden lässt, in welche Welte unsere Welt hineinreicht, und in uns den Sinn für die Allheit des Erlösungsstrebens weckt und nährt. . . . Wenn wir in seiner Gestalt und seinem Antlitz die Züge seines menschlichen Wesens zu erkennen trachten, wie schwer ist es da, die naturhaft kindlichen von den wiedergeborenen kindlichen Zügen zu scheiden, und über alles Dazwischenliegende mit einander zu verbinden; wie schwer, sie inmitten der engelhaften und luziferischen und satanischen Züge mit unserer Liebe rein umfassen zu wollen! Das vermögen wir nur dort, wo wir uns in unserem Herzen von dem Geiste führen lassen, in dem das Menschliche Richten aufhört, in dem aber Unbedingtheit und Kraft, Klarheit und Unerbittlichkeit empfangen wird, die Geister zu scheiden."

*Die Englische Sprachwissenschaft.* Von WILHELM HORN. Sonderdruck aus *Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft*, Festschrift für Wilhelm Streitberg zum 23 Februar 1924. Heidelberg. Carl Winter. (p. 512—584).

A classical scholar (I believe it was the late Professor Naber in *Allard Pierson Herdacht*, but I cannot find the passage) expressed his wonder how students of modern languages managed with regard to literature: he found a lifetime necessary to become thoroughly at home in the literature of the ancient Romans and Greeks in the limited period studied by most "classical" scholars. There is only one solution, of course, and that is to acknowledge our limitations. A lifetime is hardly enough to become acquainted with all periods of English literature in its development during a thousand years. And it becomes a practical impossibility if we wish to combine the study of language in the sense in which such study is understood since the development of modern linguistics. We must resign ourselves to know either language or literature thoroughly, although this should not mean that one of the two should be completely neglected. And even then, as this review of the present state of English language studies and the problems confronting English students suggests, our task is a very heavy one.

Professor Horn aims at reviewing the results reached by students of the English language, but still more at considering the problems that are awaiting solution. It may be instructive if I mention the subdivisions made in the 70 pages of this reasoned account.

In the first place the position of English with regard to the other West Germanic languages is discussed, and the relations between OE dialects and the tribes that conquered Britain. Next follow the works on the origins and development of Standard English, and the varieties of English outside Great Britain. Another department is lexicography, both of older and of present English, standard and dialectal. In the lists of books on place-name study Scandinavian scholars figure prominently, whereas German names are most numerous in the other departments<sup>1)</sup>. After some pages on the mutual influence of English and the languages with which it has come into contact, the author passes to a field that is a favourite pastime of many: Sounds, both of modern English and of earlier periods. The list of books is not so long for Accidence and for Syntax. Horn does not fail to point out the backwardness of English syntactical study, and the regrettable absence of anything corresponding to the famous linguistic atlas which French scholars can boast of or to the German Sprachatlas.

A review like this, even if no new discoveries are communicated, is of the greatest use, not only to beginners but also to scholars who are immersed in one of the many questions spoken of. But Professor Horn suggests new explanations in several places. In his criticism of work performed he is very generous and appreciative; his hints about imperfections must be called very gentle indeed. This is perhaps to be looked upon as a real advantage to scholarship, for there is nothing that encourages workers more than the prospect of being appreciated. — K.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Dutch names are few, but those that deserve mention are duly given.



*A Handbook of English Grammar for Belgian Students.*  
By HENRY DE VOCHT, Dr. Phil., Prof. Louv. Univ. Louvain,  
„Librairie Universelle”, Uystpruyst, publisher. 1923.

Perhaps the most abiding impression left by a perusal of Prof. de Vocht's *Handbook* is that the ideas on grammar that would seem to be prevalent among our southern neighbours, at least among students of English, are such as in Holland and the rest of Western Europe are a matter of history, at any rate among scholars. The book is cast in the mould of an antiquated categorical system, and deals with grammar as a set of 'rules' to be illustrated by means of 'applications', most of them of the author's own making. To claim finality for the methods and results of contemporary research would of course be absurd; but it is surely one of the first duties of scholarship to keep in touch with them. From this point of view the list of grammars given in the Preface shows some serious gaps. Thus, while Sweet and Jespersen are mentioned, the author's acquaintance with Dutch grammars of modern English seems to be limited, apart from Poutsma's *Grammar* (1904-5), to such completely forgotten books as those of Mertens (1884) and Kleinbentink (1896). What is worse, such modern works as have been consulted do not appear to have left any impress on the author's views.

It is one of the principles of modern linguistic research that the traditional grammatical categories of classical philology should be critically revised and adapted before applying them to other languages than Greek or Latin. Thus the Latin case-system cannot be forced on the modern English noun except by putting on it an interpretation that alters its original significance. Those, however, who think they still have a use for the traditional terminology, should apply it logically and consistently. Prof. de Vocht states that a noun is in the nominative when it is used as 1<sup>o</sup> subject, 2<sup>o</sup> predicate, 3<sup>o</sup> address or vocative. Now nominative and vocative are *two* cases. I wonder what a student unused to the vagaries of traditional — among us all but obsolete — grammar is to make of this definition: "There is no special form either for accusative or dative: the accusative being similar (*sic*) to the nominative and the dative being replaced by the accusative with or without *to*". Of a piece with this is the remark in the chapter on verbs that there are "several auxiliaries of mood which replace the subjunctive and optative". It appears that *can, may, must, ought, dare* and *need* are meant. The section on *Use of the Auxiliaries* opens in the following characteristic way: "In most cases the special senses which should (*sic*) be given to the verb by the moods, are conferred upon it by one of the several auxiliaries: these senses are so numerous and offer so many various shades and nice effects that they have become as the quintessence of the language".

The error of dealing with the facts of modern English in terms of Latin and Greek grammar is aggravated by the inclusion of a mass of Old and Middle English, even Old Germanic, detail. Thus the 'strong' verbs are reduced to the old division into six classes, followed by two groups of reduplicated verbs. A similar classification is adopted for the 'syncopated and contracted weak verbs'. This Procrustean method is clearly pseudo-scientific. The 'historic' method, as here applied, so far from making 'the acquaintance... deeper and stronger', as is claimed in the preface, is bound to lead to confusion and superficiality. A sound knowledge of the living stage should precede a *sound* study of historical development.

Matters of principle apart, I am afraid many a grammarian of the old school, if still alive, would hesitate to endorse some of Prof. de Vocht's

statements. In 'I shall read that book in a few hours', *in a few hours* is called a prepositional object. — The term 'conditional tenses' is probably due to French grammar. — One is not surprised to find the usual list of names of male and female beings in the chapter on Gender, but 'the grammatical and natural gender of some animated beings' is something of a shock. The *reductio ad absurdum* is achieved in the following caution: 'Male and female, although nouns, must not be used with a possessive pronoun: *Bee is feminine; the male of a bee is called drone*'. We should not say: *her male*! — Penny has not only the plural forms *pennies* and *pence*, but 'in some compounds is found a third form of the plural, identical with the singular', as in a *sixpenny book*.

Phonetic transcriptions are occasionally used, though with unconventional results. We learn that plural nouns in a hissing sound 'take an *ə* before the ending *z* to make it heard'.<sup>1)</sup> One of the five examples, however, has *ez*. Similarly the 'Saxon Genitive' takes *əz*, one specimen having *ez*. In view of what follows, one hesitates to call these exceptions misprints. The superlative adds *est* 'to the spoken... form of the positive'. The preterite of regular verbs in -t and -d has *ed* in the transcriptions; the 3rd p. sing of the present has *ez*, as have all of the five examples. He *doeth* = [dū'ep]. It is slightly disconcerting.

The book abounds in mistaken observations, varying from statements that have at least the sanction of time-honoured generalization, down to positive errors. Thus, according to the author, *Lord* and *Lady* followed by a proper name are never preceded by the definite article, *Emperor* always is. — All nouns in -p preceded by a long vowel or diphthong voice the final consonant in the plural. — *Just* and *full* are given among adjectives that are never compared. — The 'Norman' superlative uses 'more' and 'the most' before the positive. The 'Saxon' way of comparison is used 1<sup>o</sup> with all monosyllables, 2<sup>o</sup> with all dissyllables in -el, -el and -ow. — 'When two objects are compared, the comparative is used (as in Latin)'. — In reported speech the same auxiliary of the future tense *must* be used as in direct speech.

Slips like these are not so serious in themselves as for the light they throw upon the author's methods and ideas. There are others of a more objectionable nature. I have already mentioned the trouble with phonetic transcriptions. Greek nouns like *crisis*, pl. *crises*, are affirmed to have *iz* in the singular. When *it is* is contracted to *it's*, it is pronounced [idz]. Similarly *this is* = [ðiz iz]. — Among 'nouns of which the plural has a different meaning from that of singular' we find *gum* (resin) and *gums* bracketed; among those 'of which the plural is used in a special sense', we find the combination of *ash-es* ('forest tree') and *ashes* 'residue of things combusted'. We are also told that *forces* means 'the police'. I thought it was *the force*. — The use of *no* and *not* before comparatives is explained by stating that the former is used before 'Saxon' comparatives, the latter with 'Norman' comparatives. — Adverbial superlatives never use *the*. — The prop-word *one(s)* is not used to refer to class nouns in the plural. And so forth.

The majority of the examples are of the author's own making. Rules illustrated in this way must find their support in the authority of the writer; the reader is not given any means of judging for himself. The grammarian

<sup>1)</sup> In this case not a word on the historical development *iz-z-s*. The endings are given in inverse order.

is a lawgiver here, in accordance with the ideas of the old school. Moreover, much of the illustrative material is composed in a sort of English that would hardly be recognised by an Englishman as such. *Peasantry are rich nowadays and nobility are poor.* — *Society have been the gainers since instruction was made compulsory.* — *Nowhere are edited (published?) so many novels as in England.* — *Formerly golden (= excellent) priests celebrated their masses with wooden chalices; later on wooden (= lukewarm) priests used gold chalices.* — *It was the shame of shames to see the girl of girls in the clutches of the ruffian of ruffians.* — *St. Peter recommends to be sober and keep watch.* — The use of *so* is illustrated by the following examples: A. *Why do you not read English books?* B. *So I do!* — A. *Did you say that you met him?* B. *So I did.* -- A. *Georgine could give us a song.* B. *To be true (sic) so she could!* — 'I wonder what a teacher of commercial correspondence would say to: 'You will get all further particulars in my next favour'. — 'The demonstrative sense of the definite article is still felt in some expressions: *for the nonce* (= for that purpose)'. — 'Proper names never take the article, not even when they are preceded by their title'. Ex.: *Sir Grey*. — Has not the *old one* come yet (= father, employer)? — Space forbids further quotation.

As if all this were not enough, Professor de Vocht has written his book in English, of which he has but very indifferent command. His style lacks the precision and lucidity that are indispensable in a grammatical treatise. At times it degenerates into mere jargon. 'Whilst *may*, presupposing those potentialities, indicates that their actualizing depends either 1<sup>o</sup> upon a permission granted to the subject by a strange power; or 2<sup>o</sup> upon a conjuncture of circumstances only dimly realized or foreseen, which will induce the subject to actualize its latent powers'. A few words of frequent occurrence look as if they had usurped the place of the *mot juste*: thus *evidently* is repeatedly found where *obviously* or *naturally* is required; in the same way the author shows his fondness of *turns* (for: *expressions* or *phrases*), *next to* (for: *by the side of*), *acquaintance* (for: *knowledge*), and *sense* in many cases where *meaning* would seem preferable. Worse than these are *unvariably* (in the very first line) and *incertainty*; *disparition* (= disappearance!); for the reason *stipulated*; the 'usual' (i.e. non-progressive) form 'represents the action as being *perpetrated* in a point of time'.

I should have been glad to follow Coleridge's advice to the young, quoted by a recent contributor to this journal, that 'it is always unwise to judge any thing by its defects: the first attempt ought to be to discover its excellences'. I regret to say I have failed to detect any in the present work. Without the numerous mistakes that make it unreliable, it would at best be a superfluous archaism. It may be that the rate of foreign exchange is placing good grammars of modern English out of the reach of Belgian students. If this is so, the *Handbook* is a very poor substitute.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

## Bibliography.

### POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*Lydgate's Fall of Princes*. Edited by DR. HENRY BERGEN. In three parts. 9 × 5¾. Part I. lxxv. + 328 pp. Part. II. pp. 329-672. Part III. pp. 675-1,044. For the Early English Text Society, Milford. 15s. n. per part.

This edition of the celebrated fifteenth-century poem is prefaced by a critical introductory note, a discussion of the metre, Boccaccio's and Laurence's Prefaces and other matter. In an appendix is printed "The Daunce of Machabree." [T.]



*A Handful of Pleasant Delights* (1584). By CLEMENT ROBINSON and Divers Others. Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , xix. + 145 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 1924. 15s. n.

*Henry Vaughan, Silurist*,  $10\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ , 164 pp. Nonesuch Press. 15s. n.

*Some Newly Discovered Stanzas*: Written by JOHN MILTON on Engraved Scenes illustrating Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, now revised and reprinted, in one volume with many additional notes by HUGH C. H. CANDY.  $9 \times 6$ , 192 pp. Nisbet. 1924. 7s. 6d.

*The Shepherd's Week*: In six pastorals. By MR. J. GAY. Edited by H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 64 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1924. 4s. 6d. n.

*A Song to David*. With other poems. By CHRISTOPHER SMART. Chosen with biographical and critical preface and notes by EDMUND BLUNDEN.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 107 pp. R. Cobden-Sanderson. 1924. 6s. n.

*Madrigals and Chronicles*: Being newly found Poems written by JOHN CLARE. Edited, with a preface and commentary, by EDMUND BLUNDEN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , 102 pp. Beaumont Press (75, Charing Cross-road). 1924. 25s. n.

*Select poems of Lord de Tabley*. Edited by JOHN DRINKWATER.  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , xix. + 204 pp. Milford. 1924. 3s. 6d.

*A selection from the poems of Michael Field*.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 142 pp. Poetry Bookshop. 1924. 5s. n.

*Secrets*. By W. H. DAVIES.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 48 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1924. 3s. 6d. n.

*The Pilgrimage of Festus*. By CONRAD AIKEN.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , 75 pp. Martin Secker. 1924. 5s. n.

*Ding Dong Bell*. By WALTER DE LA MARE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , ix. + 76 pp. Selwyn and Blount. 1924. 5s. n.

*The Black Bookes Messenger*, 1592, "*Cuthbert Conny-Catcher*." The defence of Conny-Catching, 1592. By ROBERT GREENE.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 66 pp. John Lane. 3s. n.

*Johnson's Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland*, and Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, L. L. D. Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , xix. + 511 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1924. 12s. 6d. n.

*The Monk*. A Romance. By M. G. LEWIS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 221 pp. Brentano's. 1924. 12s. 6d. n.

*Jane Eyre*. By CHARLOTTE BRONTË. With lithographs by ETHEL GABAIN. Paris: Léon Pichou; London: P. and D. Colnaghi and Elkin Mathews. 495 copies, 460 for sale. £8 8s. net.

*Lilith*: A Romance. By GEORGE MACDONALD. With introductory key, a paraphrase of an earlier manuscript version, and an explanation of notes by GREVILLE MACDONALD. (Centenary Edition.) xx. + 396 pp. 7s. 6d. n.

*Fairy Tales*. By George MACDONALD. Edited by GREVILLE MACDONALD.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 435 pp. Allen and Unwin. 1924. 6s. n.

*Henry Brocken*. His travels and adventures in the rich, strange, scarce-imaginable regions of romance. By WALTER DE LA MARE. Illustrated by MARIAN ELLIS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 236 pp. Collins. 8s. 6d. n.

*The Heavenly Ladder*. By COMPTON MACKENZIE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 337 pp. Cassell. 1924. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Voyage*. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 305 pp. Constable. 1924. 7s. 6d. n.

*Mark Only*. By T. F. POWYS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 268 pp. Chatto and Windus. 1924. 7s. n.

*The Dream*. By H. G. WELLS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 320 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1924. 7s. 6d. n.

*Recent Prose*. By JOHN MASEFIELD.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , vii. + 207 pp. Heinemann. 1924. 6s. n.

*Something Childish*, and Other Stories. By KATHERINE MANSFIELD.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , ix. + 258 pp. Constable. 1924. 6s. n.

*The Triumph of Gallio*. By W. L. GEORGE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 303 pp. Chapman and Hall. 1924. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Works of Shakespeare: Much Ado About Nothing*. Edited by GRACE R. TRENER. (The Arden Shakespeare)  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , xxvii. + 161 pp. Methuen. 1924. 6s.

The 'Arden Shakespeare' is complete with this volume.

*One-Act Plays of To-Day*. Selected by J. W. MARRIOTT.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ , 255 pp. Harrap. 1924. 3s. 6d. n.

Eleven short plays by modern English, Scottish, and Irish playwrights, including Messrs. Galsworthy, Drinkwater, Milne, Bennett, and Lord Dunsany. They range from comedy and fantasy to tragedy and art, with one exception written in prose. They have been chosen for their present-day outlook and because they contain no obsolete words or obscure allusions. [T.]

*The Forest: a Dream in Four Acts*. By JOHN GALSWORTHY.  $7 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 121 pp. Duckworth. 1924. 3s. n.

*Saint Joan: A Chronicle Play in Six Scenes, and Epilogue* by BERNARD SHAW.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xiv. + 114 pp. Constable. 1924. 6s. n. [A review will appear.]

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance.* By ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.  $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , vii. + 189 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Milford. 1924. 14s. n.

*The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama.* By ALEXANDER MACLAREN WITHERSPOON.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , vi. + 197 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. \$ 2.

This study of the influence of Robert Garnier (c. 1545-c. 1590), French tragedian, on the Elizabethan drama, is the work of the Instructor in English, Yale University.

*Elizabethans.* By A. H. BULLEN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 226 pp. Chapman and Hall. 1924. 10s. 6d. n.

*A Dictionary of the Characters and the Proper Names in the Works of Shakespeare.* With Notes on the Sources and Dates of the Plays and Poems. By FRANCIS GRIFFIN STOKES.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ , xv. + 360 pp. Harrap. 21s. n.

*The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet.* By B. A. P. VAN DAM, M.D. VII + 380 pp.  $28\frac{1}{2} \times 19\frac{1}{2}$ , c.M. John Lane, The Bodley Head Ltd. London, 1924. [A review will appear.]

*The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke: A Study with the Text of the Folio of 1623.* By GEORGE MACDONALD. (Centenary Edition.)  $9 \times 6$ , xvi. + 277 pp. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d. n.

*The Disintegration of Shakespeare.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. (The Annual Shakespeare Lecture.)  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 22 pp. For the British Academy by Milford. 1924. 1s. n.

*The Title-Page of the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays: A Comparative Study of the Droeshout Portrait and the Stratford Monument.* By M. H. SPIELMANN, written for the Shakespeare Association in celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary, 1923.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , 56 pp. and 47 plates. Milford. 8s. 6d. n.

*The Women in Shakespeare's plays.* A Critical Study from the Dramatic and the Psychological Points of View in Relation to the Development of Shakespeare's Art. By AGNES MURE MACKENZIE.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xiv. + 474 pp. Heinemann. 15s. n.

*Wales and the Welsh in English Literature.* From Shakespeare to Scott. By W. J. HUGHES.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , 215 pp. Wrexham: Hughes and Son. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 5s. n.

*Le Drame de Massinger.* Par MAURICE CHELLI. Paris, Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres." 25 f.

*Life of William Congreve.* By EDMUND GOSSE, C.B.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xi. + 181 pp. Heinemann. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in 1888. The present edition, revised and enlarged, contains the fresh material that has since become available, including Dr. Protopopescu's recent contributions to the Times L.S.

*Restoration Comedy, 1660-1720.* By BONAMY DOBRÉE.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 182 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 6s. n.

*Bentley's Milton.* By J. W. MACKAIL. British Academy Warton Lecture xv.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , 21 pp. Milford 1924. 1s. 6d. net.

*Daniel De Foe et ses romans.* Par PAUL DOTTIN. Tome I: La vie et les aventures étranges et surprenantes de Daniel De Foe, natif de Londres, auteur de Robinson Crusoe. 8°, pp. x + 290. — Tome II: Robinson Crusoe, étude historique et critique. 8°, pp. 256. — Tome III: Les Romans secondaires de Daniel De Foe. 8°, pp. 352. — Les Presses Universitaires de France, and Oxford University Press, 1924. 26 fr. each. [A review will appear.]

*Robinson Crusoe.* Examined and Criticized; or a new edition of Charles Gildon's famous pamphlet now published, with an introduction and explanatory notes, together with an Essay on Gildon's Life, by PAUL DOTTIN.  $9 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 192 pp. Dent. 1924. 5s. n.

"The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Mr. D— De F— of London, Hosier," printed in 1719, is one of the works of Charles Gildon (1665-1724), hack-author and miscellaneous writer. M. Paul Dottin, author of a thesis "Daniel De Foe et ses romans," here publishes a reprint of this pamphlet (65 pp.) together with, as introduction a life of Gildon (40 pp.), copious notes, and bibliography. The whole is proposed as a thesis to the Faculty of Letters of the University of Paris. [T.]

*University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature.* Vol IX., No. 1, February, 1924. *Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe.* By ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD.  $11 \times 7\frac{1}{4}$ , 248 pp. Urbana: The University, \$ 1.50

*The Outlook.* The Presidential Address for 1922-3. By Professor J. M. MANLY, President, 1922-3. Publ. of the Mod. Hum. Res. Ass. No. 6. Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes, 1924. 1/— net.

*Shafesbury in Italy.* Id. By Doctor BENEDETTO CROCE, President, 1923-4. Id. id., No. 7. Id., 1924. 1/6 net. [In Italian.]

*Les Sources Françaises de Goldsmith.* Par ARTHUR LYTTON SELLS. Paris: Champion.  
*Johnsonian Gleanings.* By ALEYN LYELL READE. Part. IV., The Doctor's Boyhood—Appendices.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ , v. + 247 pp. Author: (Treleven House, Blundellsands, near Liverpool). 21s.

*Le roman terrifiant ou roman noir. De Walpole à Anne Radcliffe.* Par A. KILLEN. Champion, 1924. 16 fr.

*Horace Walpole.* Par PAUL YVON. Thèse de doctorat. Presses Un. de France. 1924.

*Horace Walpole as a Poet.* By PAUL YVON.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xv. + 217 pp. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1924. 15 fr.

*William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols.* By S. FOSTER DAMON.  $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ , xv + 487 pp. Constable. 42s. n.

*Byron, 1824-1924.* A Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford on May 14, 1924. By H. W. GARROD.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 22 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Milford. 1s. 6d. n.

*Byron as Critic.* By CLEMENT TYSON GOODE.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ , 312 pp. Weimar: R. Wagner Sohn. 1924.

*Byron the Man.* By R. L. BELLAMY.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 245 pp. Kegan Paul. 5s. n.

*Byron and Greece.* By HAROLD SPENDER.  $9 \times 6$ , ix. + 336 pp. Murray. 1924, 15 s. n.

*La Vie de Lord Byron.* Par R. BOUTET DE MONVEL. Plon-Nourrit, 1924. 12 fr.

*Byron, 1788-1824.* Par E. RODOCANACHI. Hachette, 1924. 12 fr.

*Byron: The Rede Lecture for 1924.* By HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 57 pp. Cambridge: University Press. 1924. 2s. 6d. n.

*Byron in Perspective.* By J. D. SYMON.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xiii. + 298 pp. Martin Secker. 1924. 12s. 6d. n.

*Percy Bysshe Shelley: Poet and Pioneer.* By HENRY S. SALT.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 135 pp. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. n.

First published in 1896.

*Shelley in German.* By SOLOMON LIPTZIN, Ph. D. New York, Columbia University Press. 1924. Pp. 97. Price \$1.50. [A review will appear.]

*Jane Welsh Carlyle: Letters to Her Family, 1839-1863.* Edited by LEONARD HUXLEY.  $9 \times 6$ , xxi. + 390 pp. Murray. 1924, 21s. n.

*Carlyle and Mill. Mystic and Utilitarian.* By EMMERY NEFF.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , vii. + 334 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. \$2.25.

This study of Carlyle and Mill and of their place in history and philosophy is one of the series of Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.

*Patrick Branwell Brontë.* By ALICE LAW.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 192 pp. A. M. Philpot. 1924. 6s. n.

*Patrick Brontë.* By JAMES SENIOR.  $6\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , 56 pp. Boston, Mass.: Stratford and Co.

This sketch of the life of Patrick Brontë (1777-1861) ends with his marriage, the birth of his four children, and his removal in 1820 to Haworth.

*Mrs. Gaskell: Novelist and Biographer.* By J. J. VAN DULLEMEN.  $24 \times 15\frac{1}{2}$ , pp. 232. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1924.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*The London of Charles Dickens.* Being an Account of the Haunts of His Characters and the Topographical Setting of His Novels. By E. BERESFORD CHANCELLOR.  $9 \times 6$ , 327 pp. Grant Richards. 1924. 15s. n.

*A George Eliot Dictionary: The Characters and Scenes of the Novels, Stories, and Poems.* Alphabetically arranged. By ISADORE G. MUDGE and M. E. SEARS.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xlvii. + 260 pp. Routledge. 12s. 6d. n.

*Ancient Rome in the English Novel.* A study in English historical fiction. By RANDOLPH FARRIES.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ . Philadelphia: Lyon and Armor. \$2.—

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*Studies in Mid-Victorian Imperialism.* By C. A. BODELSEN.  $9 \times 6$ , 226 pp. Constable. 1924. 10s. 6d. n.

*George Meredith.* Par LUCIEN WOLFF. Payot, 1924. 12 fr. [A review will appear.]

*Robert Louis Stevenson: Some Personal Recollections.* By the late LORD GUTHRIE.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , 72 pp. Edinburgh: W. Green. 5s. net.

First published in 1920 at 21s.

*Thomas Hardy's Universe: A Study of a Poet's Mind.* By ERNEST BRENNKE, JUN.  $9 \times 6$ , 153 pp. Fisher Unwin, 1924. 8s. 6d. net.



*A Short History of Modern English Literature.* By EDMUND GOSSE, C.B.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , ix. + 455 pp. Heinemann. 8s. 6d. net.

This volume belongs to the series of "Short Histories of the Literatures of the World", edited by Mr. Gosse himself. There are fifteen of these histories already published; and the present one, which first appeared in 1897, was among the earliest. Over a quarter of a century having passed, carrying on and enriching the history of English literature, the final chapter has been cancelled and replaced by two chapters bringing the story down a quarter of a century later than was done in 1897. [T.]

*Some Early Impressions.* By LESLIE STEPHEN.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 193 pp. Hogarth Press. 7s. 6d. n.

*Last Essays of Maurice Hewlett.*  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 314 pp. Heinemann, 1924. 8s. 6d. net.

*Studies in English.* By Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University, Prague. First Volume. 1924. 12 Kč.

Contents: Dr. Bohumil Trnka, 'Studies in the syntactical and phraseological history of the verb to have' (3-32, Summary 33-35, Bibliography 36-38). — Dr. Vladimír Vědyš, 'Introductory chapter to a study of the comic and the pathetic in Shakespeare's Comedies' (45-57, Summ. 58-59, Bibl. 60). — Dr. František Sedláček, 'H. Taine's criticism of the English romantic movement' (65-77, Summ. 78-79, Bibl. 80). — František Souček, 'Religious experience in the works of H. G. Wells' (85-120, Summ. 121-124, Bibl. 125).

Articles in Czech, Summaries in English.

*Joseph Conrad.* By HUGH WALPOLE. (New and revised Edition. Writers of the Day Series.)  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , 127 pp. Nisbet, 1924. 2s. net.

*Essays.* By W. B. YEATS.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , viii. + 538 pp. Macmillan, 1924. 10s. 6d. net.

*Walter de la Mare.* A Biographical and Critical Study. By H. L. MÉROZ.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , xi. + 303 pp. Hodder and Stoughton, 1924. 7s. 6d. net.

*The Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature.*  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , 432 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. \$ 5.00.

A volume of research studies in honour of Mr. John Mathews Manly, Head of the Department of English in the University of Chicago, on the conclusion of twenty-five years of this service. They deal with English literature, with literature other than English, and with linguistics, and are of very wide range and of considerable interest, particularly to specialists. "The Name of the Green Knight"; "Was Chaucer a Student at the Inner Temple?"; "Shakespeare as a Writer of Epitaphs"; "Some Immediate Effects of the Beggars' Opera"; "A Visit to Henry James"; and "The Origin of the Miracle Play" are the titles of some of those of widest appeal. [T.]

*Essays by Divers Hands.* Being the transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. Edited by EDMUND GOSSE. New Series. Vol. IV.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , x. + 158 pp. Milford. 7s. 6d. net.

*The Twentieth-Century Theatre.* By FRANK VERNON. With an Introduction by JOHN DRINKWATER.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 159 pp. Harrap. 5s. net.

*Bernard Shaw.* By EDWARD SHANKS. (Writers of the Day.)  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 128 pp. Nisbet, 1924. 2s. net.

*Figures in Modern Literature.* By J. B. PRIESTLEY.  $9 \times 6$ , 215 pp. John Lane. 7s. 6d. net.

*Studies in Classic American Literature.* By D. H. LAWRENCE.  $9 \times 6$ , 175 pp. Martin Secker. 10s. 6d. net.

*A Book of English Prosody.* By SYDNEY GREW. Pp. XII + 238. Grant Richards, 1924. 6/- net. [A review will appear.]

*Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise.* Par E. LEGOUIS et L. CAZAMIAN. Pp. XIII + 1312. Hachette, Paris, 1924. Broché, 17.50 fr.; cartonné 20 fr. [A review will appear.]

#### LANGUAGE.

*Over den ontwikkelingsgang van de verbuiging der germaansche zelfstandige naamwoorden.* Door Dr. F. KALDA. Pp. 102. 1923.

Written in Dutch by a Czech scholar. Summary (2 $\frac{1}{4}$  pages) in English.

*The Old English Andreas and Bishop Acca of Hexham.* By ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , pp. 246-332. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. \$ 1.20.

*De taalvorming van 't middelengelse gedicht Havelok.* Door J. H. KERN. Mededeelingen der koninkl. akad. van wetensch., afd. letterkunde, deel 55, serie A, no. 2. Amsterdam 1923. Pp. 35. 8°.

*The Folewer to the Donet.* By REGINALD PECOCK. DD. Now first edited from Brit. Mus. Roy. MS., 17 D. IX. With an introduction on Pecock's language and style by ELSIE VAUGHAN HITCHCOCK.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , lxxx. + 263 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Milford, 1924. 30s. net.

Reginald Pecock (c. 1395-c. 1460), Bishop successively of St. Asaph and Chichester, was the author of numerous theological works, of which only single copies of five have come down to us, the others having been burned after his trial and condemnation for heresy in 1457. The "Donet", written about 1443, is an introduction to the chief truths of the Christian faith in the form of a dialogue. "The Folewer to the Donet," which Miss Hitchcock dates at about 1453-4, exists in a single manuscript in the British Museum. This edition of the text is accompanied by an introduction dealing with the manuscript and with Pecock's life, language, and style, by a summary of contents, notes, appendix, and glossary. [T.]

*Echoes of the Pilgrim Fathers' Speech.* By A. J. BARNOUW. Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde. Deel 55, Serie A, No. 6. Amsterdam, 1923. Pp. 139—189.

*The Philosophy of Grammar.* By OTTO JESPERSEN. 9 × 6, 359 pp. Allen and Unwin, 1924. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names*, Part I. Edited by A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON 9 × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xii. + 189 pp. *The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names.* Being the second part of the Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names. Edited by ALLEN MAWER. 9 × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, x. + 67 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1924. 21 s. net.

#### PERIODICALS.

**De Gids.** Mei 1924. Dr. André Jolles, Byron (19, IV. 1824) (pp. 205—218). — Dr. J. Huizinga, Engelschen en Nederlanders in Shakespeare's tijd. I (pp. 219—235). — **Id.** Juni 1924. Huizinga, id., II (pp. 367—383).

**Leuvense Bijdragen.** XVI, 1—2. (1924). Includes A. H. Krappe, The legends of Amicus and Amelius and of King Horn (pp. 14—17).

**Revue de Littérature Comparée.** IV, 2. Avril—Juin 1924. Includes: J. M. Carré, Michelet et l'Angleterre.

**Revue Anglo-Américaine.** I, 5. Juin 1924. A. Rébelliau, Bossuet et sa renommée en Angleterre. — F. Delattre, Le réalisme poétique de John Masefield. — A. Brulé, James Stephens. — R. Pruvost, L'héritage de Lincoln. — **Id.** I, 6. Août 1924. P. Descamps, Les origines protestantes du féminisme anglo-saxon. — L. Wolff, Le sentiment médiéval en Angleterre au XIXe siècle, et la première poésie de William Morris: I. — V. Taffe, Bacon et Montaigne essayistes. — J. Malye, Les Mémoires de Wolfe Tone: I.

**Mercure de France.** 15 Avril 1924. J. Charpentier, Lord Byron ou le romantisme flamboyant.

**Revue de France.** 1er Mars 1924. P. Dottin, La venue de George Meredith. — **Id.** 1er Avril 1924. — A. Chevrillon, A propos du centenaire de Byron.

**Vie des Peuples.** Janv. 1924. Mad. Cazamian, W. B. Yeats, poète de l'Irlande.

**Revue hebdomadaire.** 23 Févr. 1924. G. J. Aubry, Joseph Conrad.

**Revue de Paris.** 1er Avril 1924. A. Maurois, Lord Byron et le démon de la tendresse.

**Revue des Deux-Mondes.** 1er Avril 1924. E. Pilon, La mort de Lord Byron.

**Englische Studien.** 57, 3. Cohn, Ist die wortstellung ein brauchbares kriterium für die chronologie ags. denkmäler? — Else von Schaubert, Der engl. ursprung von Syr Gawayn and the grene Knyght. — F. Wild, John Drinkwater. — Reviews and Notes. — **Id.** 58 (1). Flasdieck, Ein südost-mittelenglischer lautwandel. — W. Clyde Curry, Chauntecler and Pertelote on dreams. — Helene Richter, Thomas de Quincey. — Reviews and Notes. — **Id.** 58 (2). F. Holthausen, Studien zu den Towneley Plays. — J. Koch, Echte und "unechte" Masken. W. Fischer, Defoe und Milton. — M. Eimer, Ein ungedruckter brief von Byron. — Morsbach, Meine lehrstätigkeit an der universität Göttingen in den jahren 1892 bis 1922. — Reviews, including an article by Luick on Horn's *Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion*. The Notes mention that in Wurtemberg English has become the first foreign language in the mädchenrealschulen (seven hours a week) and a compulsory subject in the gymnasia, French becoming an optional subject.

**Anglia.** 48, 1 (1924). Ruprecht, Felicia Hemans und die englischen beziehungen zur deutschen lit. im ersten drittel des 19ten jahrh. — F. Brie, Deismus und atheismus in der engl. renaissance. — S. J. Crawford, A Latin parallel for part of the Later Genesis? — O. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur ae. wortforschung. — 48, 2. Brie, Deismus etc. (Schluss). — Ruprecht, Hemans, II.

**Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen lit. und spr.** 48, 3 (1924). Includes Flasdieck, Zur charakteristik der sprachlichen verhältnisse in altengl. zeit.

**Indogerm. Forschungen.** 41 (1923). Includes Josef Weisweiler, Beiträge zur bedeutungsentwicklung germanischer wörter für sittliche begriffe I. — Walter Porzig, Der begriff der inneren sprachform.

**Zs. f. d. franz. u. engl. Unterricht.** 23, 1. Includes Kurt Horn, William Michael Rossetti. — Report of the Fortbildungslehrgang der Neusprachler des Sächsischen Philologenvereins in der Universität zu Leipzig. — Reviews.

**Germ.-Rom. Monatsschrift.** 12, 3/4. Includes Schücking, Die grundlagen des Richardson'schen Romans. — Notes. Reviews. — **Id.** 12, heft 5/6 (May—June 1924). Includes Forchhammer, Weltalphabet und weltlautschrift. — Aronstein, Der soziologische charakter des engl. Renaissance-dramas I.

**Beiblät zur Anglia.** 35, 3/5. Reviews, including Aronstein on Miss Frijlinck, The Tragedy of Sir John van Olden Barnaveit. — Fehr on the latest books on Shakespeare's handwriting by Thompson, Pollard, a.o. — Ekwall on Attenborough, The Laws of the Earliest English Kings. — Fehr on De Groot, Hamlet, Its Textual History.

**Neuere Sprachen.** 32, 1. Includes Schücking, Zu den Anfängen des Familienlebens in England. — Wild, Gordon Bottomleys Dramen. — Notes. — Reviews, including Fritz Karpf on Grase, Oefeningen; Kruisinga and Schutt, Lessons in English Grammar. Also W. Fischer on Kruisinga, Handbook II. — **Id.** 32, 2. Includes Helene Richter, Lord Byron. — Notes. — Reviews, including Holthausen on Hilfsmittel zum Studium der niederländischen sprache (Downs and Jackson, Valette, van de Kerckhove, van der Meer).

**Modern Language Review.** XIX, April, 1924. E. E. Stoll, Literature no 'Document'. — M. Hope Dodds, 'Edmond Ironside' and 'The Love-sick King'. — Marie L. Barker, Joshua Steele on Speech-Melody (1779). — V. M. Jeffery, Italian and English Pastoral Drama of the Renaissance. II. The Source of Peele's 'Arraignment of Paris'. — René P. Legros, Diderot et Shaftesbury. — J. Knight Bostock, Brentano's 'Legende der heiligen Maria'.

**The Quarterly Review.** No. 479. April, 1924. Lord Ernle, The Poetry of Byron. — S. L. Bensusan, The Bee in Literature. — Christopher Hussey, The Decay of of English Country Life. — J. H. Morgan, The Personality of Lord Morley. Part II. — William Archer, Elizabethan Stage and Restoration-Drama.

**The Criterion.** II, 7. April, 1924. Charles Whibley, Lord Chesterfield. — J. Middleton Murry, Romanticism and the Tradition. — E. R. Curtius, On the Style of Marcel Proust.

**Contemporary Review.** No. 698. Febr. 1924. The Rev. Dr. G. W. Wade, Biblical Phrases in Context and Currency. — **Id.** No. 699. March 1924. Dr. E. E. Stoll, Recent Criticism of Hamlet. — **Id.** No. 700. April, 1924. Walter A. Briscoe, Byron as Politician. — **Id.** No. 701. May, 1924. Miss Phyllis Bottome, The Life of Olive Schreiner.

**Fortnightly Review.** Febr. 1924. Hugh I. A. Fausset, Synge and Tragedy. April, 1924. H. C. Minchin, Byron: "Flame and Power". — W. Bailey Kempling, Lord Byron in Monumental Record. — Lucie Simpson, The Sex Bias of "Measure for Measure".

**Edinburgh Review.** No. 488. April, 1924. C. E. Lawrence, The Personality of Byron.

**Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.** XXXIX, No. 1. March 1924. — American Bibliography for 1923. — Robert K. Root and Henry N. Russell, A Planetary Date for Chaucer's *Troilus*. — Ezra Kempton Maxfield, Chaucer and Religious Reform. — Grace W. Landrum, Chaucer's Use of the Vulgate. — Ernest P. Kuhl, Chaucer and Aldgate. — Willard Farnham, England's Discovery of the *Decameron*. — John K. Bonnell, Cain's Jaw-bone. — Winifred Smith, The Earl of Essex on the Stage. — Martin A. Larson, The Influence of Milton's Divorce Tracts on Farquhar's *Beaux Stratagem*. — Stanley P. Chase, Hazlitt as a Critic of Art. — Hélène Hudson, How Henry James Revised *Roderick Hudson*.

**Modern Philology.** XXI, 3. Febr. 1924. Charles Read Baskerville, Mummers' Wooing Plays in England. — Paul Kaufman, The Reading of Southey and Coleridge: The Record of Their Borrowings from the Bristol Library, 1793–98.

**Modern Language Notes.** XXXIX, 4. April 1924. Includes: H. N. Clark, A study of melancholy in Edward Young. Part II. — G. F. Flom, Place-name tests of racial mixture in northern England. — R. G. Martin, The sources of Heywood's *If you know not me, you know nobody*, part I. — T. V. Mabbott, A new poem by Thomas Chatterton. — **Id.** 5. May 1924. Includes: W. H. Wells, Chaucer as a literary critic. — G. S. Greene, A new date for George Wilkins's *Three Miseries of Barbary*. — **Id.** 6. June 1924. Includes: G. R. Potter, Thomas Chatterton's *Epistle to the Reverend Mr. Catcott*. — A. W. Crawford, The apparitions in *Macbeth*.

**Journal of English and German Philology.** XXIII, 1. Jan. 1924. Includes: O. F. Emerson, The early literary life of Sir Walter Scott, I. — E. C. Knowlton, Chaucer's Man of Law. — A. S. Cook, Aldhelm's legal studies. — **Id.** 2. April 1924. Includes: A. H. Nethercot, The reputation of the 'Methaphysical Poets' during the 17th century. — O. F. Emerson, The early literary life of Sir Walter Scott, II.

**Philological Quarterly.** III, 1. Jan. 1924. Includes: B. V. Crawford, Teaching by dialogue. — B. M. Hollowell, The Elizabethan Hexametrists. — R. Gould Goree, Concerning repetitions in Greene's romances. — D. C. Croissant, A note on *The Egoist: or, Colley upon Clobber*. **Id.** III, 2. April 1924. Incl.: S. T. Williams, Macaulay's reading and literary criticism. — C. L. Finney, Shakespeare and Keats's *Hyperion*.



# The Dialect of the Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter.

§ 1). The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter is extant in three manuscripts: Brit. Mus. Additional 17376; Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys 2498; Trinity College, Dublin, A. 4. 4.<sup>1)</sup> The British Museum MS., written c. 1340—1350, is the only one that has been printed (EETS. 97, ed. Bülbring). The editor states (Introd. p. IX) that the dialect "is almost pure West Midland", but he gives no reasons for this verdict. Other writers, apparently following Bülbring, speak of the Psalter as West Midland, sometimes calling it "The West Midland Prose Psalter", (Wells, p. 402; Emerson: Middle English Reader; etc.)<sup>2)</sup> I propose in the following pages to analyse the dialect of the text, to compare it with some undoubtedly West Midl. documents, and to discuss its possible place of origin. I hope to show, as a result of the investigation, that the dialect of the Psalter has none of the distinctive features of the dialects of the W. Midl. texts, but seems to resemble that of a Central Midl. area, probably Northamptonshire.

§ 2). The principal dialect features of the *Psalter* are as follows (for a fuller analysis see p. 188): 1). OE.  $\alpha = a$ : *fader*, *fatt*, *what*, *spak*, *that*, *water*, etc.; occasionally *e* in *efter* (most probably the Scand. *eftir*). 2). OE.  $\bar{a}^1 = e$ : *dedes*, *even*, *sede* 'seed', *slepe*, *speches*, *stretes*, *were*, etc.; when shortened, usually *a*: *drad*, *dradde*, *naddres*, etc. but *e* once: *nedders*. 3). OE.  $\bar{a}^2 = e$ : *euer*, *clene*, *whete* 'wheat', *hele* 'heal', *lede* 'lead' *teche*, etc.; when shortened, *a*: *ladde*, *laddest*, *laft*, *sprad*, *spradden*, etc. 4). OE.  $\bar{y}$ : usually *i*; a few *u* and *e*-forms, *u* invariably in *fur*, OE. *fȳr*: *bigge* 'buy', *biried*, *bisi*, *kinde*, *fulfillen*, *fild*, *rigge*, *hiden*, *hyl*, *stiren*, *sinne*, *wirchen*, *iuel*, etc.; *fur*, *mund* 'mind', *hulles*; *helles*, *shette*, 'shut', *hed* 'hid', *kende* (OE. *gecȳnd*), etc. 5). OE.  $\check{o} = e$ : *ben*, *beþ*, *erpe*, *fel*, (OE. *fēoll*), *derk*, *fer*, *hertes*, *prest*, *sterres*, *werkes*, etc.; *o* appears once: *fondes* (OE. *fēond*). 6). OE.  $\bar{e}a + i$ : *e*: *heren*, *herd*, *leuen*, etc. OE.  $\bar{a}l + cons.$  + *i*: *e*: *welle*, but once *wille*. 7). OE.  $\bar{a}l + cons.$ : (Lengthened) usually *o*: *old*, *cold*, *holde*, *solde*, *told*, etc.; but also *e*: *elde* (Adj.), *telde*, *welde*, (N.) etc. (Unlengthened) *al*: *half*, *fallen*, *halles*, etc.; also forms showing fracture: *chalf*, *chalues*. 8). OE. *ear + cons.*: generally *ar*: *art*, *arme*, *hard*, *harp*, *sharp*, etc.; *e* rarely in *ert*. 9). OE.  $\bar{e}ag$ ,  $\bar{e}ah$ : *eȝ*, *eȝe*, *heȝe*, *heȝest*, *neȝe*, etc. 10). OE. *a + nasal*: (Lengthened) *o*: *honde*, *long*, *londe*, *stonden*, etc.; (Unlengthened) *a*: *fram*, *bigan*, *man*, *mani*, *name*, etc. 11). 3<sup>rd</sup> Sing. Pres. Indicative. -*eþ*: *entreþ*, *goþ*, *haþ*, *hideþ*, *knoweþ*, *loueþ*, *makeþ*, *telleþ*, *turneþ*, etc. 12). Plur. Pres. -*en*: *arisen*, *asken*, *fallen*, *hopen*, *liuen*, *saien*, *tellen*, etc. 13). Pres. Participle: -*and*: *brekand*, *comand*, *dredand*, *falland*, *hopand*, *makand*, *saiaand*, *sittand*, etc. 14). Feminine Pronoun. (Nom.) *she*; (Gen.) *hir*, *her*; 15). Plural Pronoun. (Nom.) *hij*; (Gen.) *her*; (Dat.) *hem*. 16). Plur. of 'be': *ben*. 17). Past Part.: Ending of Strong Verbs: -*en*: *chosen*, *fallen*, *hulpen*, *taken*, *wasshen*, *wryten*, etc. Prefix *i-* very rare. 18). Infinitive: -*en*, -*e*: *bliscen*, *breken*, *crien*, *dien*, *dwellen*, *folwen*, etc.; *arise*, *come*, *crye*, *haue*, *kepe*, *loue*, *speke*, etc.

<sup>1)</sup> Wells, p. 403.

For list of abbreviations see p. 188.

<sup>2)</sup> Dr. Hirst (*The Phonology of the London MS. of the E. E. Pr. Ps.*) does not give a definite opinion on the dialect.

§ 3). This brief analysis presents a picture of a fairly well marked dialect; such variations as occur in the representation of some of the vowels (e.g. Nos. 1, 4, 7) are found in numbers of M.E. texts, and are not necessarily due to the scribe's alteration of the original manuscript. Nos. 2 and 3 ( $\bar{a}^1$  and  $\bar{a}^2$ ) both seem to be represented by [ɛ]. The combination of this with the Pres. Part. in *-ande*, and of the latter with definite traces of fracture (of  $\bar{a}$  before *l* + cons.), is unusual, and should be of assistance in locating the dialect. The points that make it difficult to assign the text to the West Midland area, are Nos. 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15. To make this clear, it will be best to discuss each point in turn, comparing the type found in the *Psalter* with that occurring in definitely West Midland documents. The following texts will be used for comparison: 13<sup>th</sup> century, *Lazamon* (early MS.); 14<sup>th</sup> century, *Harley Lyrics* (MS. written at Leominster, in Herefordshire, c. 1310); *Robert of Gloucester* (MS. Caligula, c. 1320—1340); 15<sup>th</sup> century, *Myrc's Instructions for Parish Priests* (c. 1450). For further illustration, reference will be made to the following: *Ancren Riwele*; *Katharine Group*; *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*; *Alliterative Poems*. It will be seen that there are certain points in which all these texts agree, and in which they are in opposition to the dialect of the *Psalter*.<sup>1)</sup>

§ 4). OE.  $\ddot{a}$ . The 13<sup>th</sup> century West Midland documents have *e* as the predominating form; the *Katharine Group* has *e* invariably: *efter*, *feder*, *creftes*, *gled*, *hwet*, *wes*, *weter*, etc. The *Ancren Riwele* (Morton's text) has *a* after *w*, otherwise *e*: *efter*, *et*, *cweð*, *eppel*, *feder*, *glede*, *pet*, etc.; *hwat*, *was*, *water*, etc. *Lazamon* has both *a* and *e* ( $\bar{a}$ ), the latter being the more frequent: *after*, *blac*, *craft*, *fader*, *glad*, *spac*, *pat*, *was*, etc.; *æfter*, *fæder*, *glæd*, *spæc*, *wæs*, *wætere*, etc.; *efter*, *crefte*, *fest*, *hefde*, *gled*, *set*, *pet*, *wes*, *whet*, etc. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century W. Midl. texts, *a* is the usual form; *e* is fairly common in the *Harley Lyrics*: *gled*, *bed*, *whet*, *spec*, *wes*, etc.; *bake*, *after*, *appel*, *fat*, *glad*, *craft*, *what*, *sad*, *pat*, *was*, *water*, etc. *Robt. of Glos.* has only *a*: *after*, *bapes*, *brac*, *fader*, *fatte*, *quap*, *glad*, *hadde*, *pat*, *was*, etc. There are a few examples of *e* in the *Allit. Poems* and *Sir Gawayne*, but only in the Preterite Singular of Str. Vbs. of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> classes, where it may be due to the analogy of the Pret. Plural: *after*, *bak*, *craft*, *fader*, *glad*, *hasel*, *appel*, *was*, *what*, etc.; but *bed*, *brek*, *gef*, *set*, *ber*, etc. *Myrc* has always *a*. This point gives no evidence either for or against the W. Midl. origin of the *Psalter*.

§ 5). OE.  $\bar{a}^1$ . There is no very definite evidence in *Lazamon* as to the quality of this vowel; very few shortened forms occur, both *e* and *a* being used: *radde*, *redde*; *wapmen*, *wepmen*, etc. But *e* may here represent OE.  $\bar{a}$ . The vowel is rhymed occasionally with OE.  $\bar{e}a$  and with  $\bar{a}^2$ , which seems to indicate a slack vowel, but the rhymes in this text are so irregular that it is perhaps unsafe to trust them. There are few examples of spellings with *ea* (I have noted 11 in the whole poem), and not many with  $\bar{a}$ , though the latter is the usual form for  $\bar{a}^2$ . In the *Harley Lyrics* shortened forms are rare; *radde* occurs once, but also *dred* and *dredful*. The *Ancren Riwele* and the *Kath. Group* write *e*, and sometimes, though not often, *ea*. *Robt. of Glos.* has always *a* when shortened: *radde*, *dradde*, etc. The more northerly texts, *Myrc*, *Sir Gawayne*, and the *Allit. Poems*, have *e* in the shortened forms; in the dialects of these documents  $\bar{a}^1$  is apparently tense. The *Psalter* seems to have a slack vowel [ɛ] for  $\bar{a}^1$ ; this is what one would expect for any southern midland text, whether western or central.

<sup>1)</sup> See comparative table.

§ 6). OE.  $\bar{a}$ <sup>2</sup>. This vowel is evidently represented by [ɛ] in the dialects of all the W. Midl. texts. *Lazamon* writes  $\bar{a}$  as a rule : *æuer*, *ær*, *dælen*, *læden*, *læuen* 'leave', *sæ* 'see', *bitæche*, etc.; also *a*, *e*, *ea* : *ar*, *auer*, *clane*, *laden*, *ladden*, *sa* 'sea', *spradde*; *er*, *euer*, *heðen*, *hele*, *leden*, *ledden*, etc.; *deal*, *leaden*, *leadde*, *sea*, *teachen*, etc. The *Ancr. Riwle* has *e* and *ea* : *clene*, *delen*, *iled* (P.P.), *leren* 'teach', *teched*, etc.; *cleane*, *dealen*, *heale*, *leafdi* 'lady', etc. The *Kath. Group* has *ea* and *e*, the former being the more usual : *healen*, *eauer*, *leaden*, *leadde*, *sea*, etc.; *euer*, *heðene*, *ledde*, *er*, etc. The *Harley Lyrics*, *Robt. of Glos.*, *Sir Gawayne*, *Allit. Poems*, and *Myrc*, all have *e*, but *a* when shortened. (*Sir Gawayne*): *clene*, *delen*, *euer*, *hepe* 'heath', *leder*, *teche*, etc.; *clannes*, *clanly*, *ladde*, *laft*. (*Allit. Poems*): *clene*, *dele*, *euer*, *flesch*, *lede*, *see*, *teche*, etc.; *clanly*, *lad*, *laddres* 'leaders', *laft*, *spradde*, etc. (*Harl. Lyrics*): *erst*, *clene*, *dele*, *heþene*, *lede*, *leuen* 'leave', *sprede*, etc.; *laddest*, *ylad*, *spradde*. (*Robt. of Glos.*): *clanliche*, *iclansed*, *ladde*, *ylad*, *sprad*, etc. (*Myrc*): *hele* 'heal', *clene*, *lede*, *techen*, *whete* 'wheat', etc. The *Psalter* agrees with all these texts in having [ɛ]; *e* is written regularly, except when the vowel is shortened, in which case *a* is used (see § 2 [3]).

§ 7). OE.  $\ddot{y}$ . *Lazamon* has *u*, except in the prefix *kine-*, OE. *cyne-*; *bugge* 'buy', *burie* 'bury', *cunne*, *fulde*, 'filled', *hul*, *murie*, *rugge*, *punched*, *ufele*, etc.; *kinedom*, *kinelond*, *kineborene*, *kinestole*, etc. The *Ancr. Riwle* has always *u*: *brugge*, *cunne*, *cussed*, *guldene*, *hurnen*, *hulles*, *kuchene*, *mulne* 'mill', *put*, etc. The *Kath. Group* has *u* except in *kine-*<sup>1)</sup>, as in *Lazamon*: *buggen*, *cunnes*, *fur* 'fire', *guldene*, *huddle* 'hid', *lure* 'loss', *lutel*, *sunne*, *uuel*, *wurchen*, *put* 'pit', *druifot*, etc.; *kinedom*, *kineburh*, *kinering*, etc. *Robt. of Glos.* has usually *u*; *i* a few times before *n*; and always in *kine*; *e* always in *ferst*: *burie*, *kunde*, *kunne*, *fulle* 'fill', *fur*, *gult*, *hude* 'hide', *hulle*, *hurne*, *lutel*, *munstre*, *putte*, *sunne*, *wurche*, *vuel*, etc.; *ferst*, *verste*, 'first', *velle* 'fill'; *kinne*, *kinde*, *sinne*, *kinedom*, etc. The *Harley Lyrics* have *u*, a few *i*-forms before *n*: *brugge*, *brude* 'bride', *bugge* 'buy', *kunne*, *cusse*, *drue* 'dry', *fur*, *furst*, *hul*, *lutel*, *mulne*, *sunne*, *þunne* 'thin', *wurchen*, etc.; *kyneriche*, *kynde*, *synne*, *þynne*, etc. *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems* have considerably more *i*- than *u*-forms; *e*-forms occur very rarely: *busy*, *brugge*, *cruppele*, *brused*, *furst*, *hude*, *kuy* 'cows', *mulne*, *gurd*, etc.; *brygge*, *dyn*, *fylle*, *fyr*, *hyden*, *first*, *kysse*, *kyn*, *kynde*, *littel*, *myry*, *rygge*, *synne*, *drye*, *hilles*, *hyrne*, *pit*, etc.; *mery*, *schet* 'shut', *merthe*, *wertes*, etc. *Myrc* has a large number of *i*-forms, but the majority of these are before *n*; the *u*-forms are about twice as numerous as the *i*-forms before other consonants: *burye*, *fulle*, *fuyre*, *huyde*, *luytel*, *putte*, etc.; *knyt*, *fyrst*, *bye* 'buy', *abygge*, etc.; *synne*, *kynde*, *dynt*, *mynde*, *kyinne*, etc. None of these texts show any special tendency to unround  $\ddot{y}$  before a front consonant. The *Psalter* has a much larger proportion of *i*- to *u*-forms than any of the W. Midland texts; the only word spelt regularly with *u* is OE. *fȳr*; apart from this, there are only three examples of *u*-spellings. *e*-forms are found, though not frequently.

§ 8). OE.  $\bar{e}o$ . The W. Midland texts all seem to agree in having a rounded vowel for OE.  $\bar{e}o$ . This is expressed by the French symbol *u*, *ue*, occasionally by *o*, and in the earlier MSS. by *eo*. The spelling *e* is in most cases the usual form; it is probable that both the [ɛ] and the [y], [ø] types of pronunciation obtained in the West Midlands. *Lazamon* has generally *eo*; there are a fair number of *u*- and *o*-forms, and also of *e*, the latter being the usual form before a back consonant: *beon* 'be', *deop*, *deor*, *feol* 'feil' *heold*,

<sup>1)</sup> This prefix does not occur in *Ancr. Riwle*.



*loef*, *cheorl*, *heorte*, *feorðe*, *eorðe*, *heouene*, *preost*, etc.; *fer*, *ferðe*, *herte*, *hercne*, *fehten*, *wer*c, etc.: *buð* 'are', *dure* 'dear', *fullen* 'fell', *hunne* 'hence', *hurte* 'heart', *suddēn* 'since', etc.; *horte*, *soððen*, *soue* 'seven', *brost*, etc. The *Ancr. Riwe* has *eo* except before a back cons.: *eorðe*, *feorðe*, *heorte*, *seouene*, *seodēn*, *beon*, *deouel*, *deore*, *seon*, *leoue*, etc.; *hercnen*, *berkest*, *wer*c, etc. The *Kath. Group* makes the same distinction: *beon*, *deope*, *deore*, *eorðe*, *freond*, *heorte*, *leosen*, *heold*, *steorre*, etc.; *hercne*, *wer*c, etc. *Robt. of Glos.* has usually *e*, together with a good many *u*-forms and a few *eo*; here again there is evidence of Smoothing: *eo*, *u*, never appear before a back consonant: *binepe*, *chese*, *dep*, *dere*, *derc*, *erl*, *vel* 'fell', *verpe* 'fourth', *held*, *herte*, *lese*, *sterre*, *þef*, etc.; *binupe*, *brust*, *huld*, *prustes*, *suppe* 'since', etc.; *deop*, *eode* 'went', *heold*, *neode*, etc. The *Harley Lyrics* have *e*, with a large proportion of *u*, *ue*, and *eo* forms: *fel*, *fer*, *heuene*, *tre*, *herkne*, *herte*, *lerne*, *sterre*, *þeues* 'thieves', *werk*, etc.; *buþ*, *furpe*, *huld*, *lurnen*, *buen*, *duere*, *huerte*, *luēf* 'dear', *pruest*, *suen* 'see', *þuef* 'thief', etc.; *cheosen*, *deope*, *deore*, *eorl*, *feol*, *feond*, *leosen*, etc. *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems* have *e* as a rule, but also a few *u* forms, the latter chiefly for OE. *ēo* before *r* + point cons., the only exception being *lude*, *ludych* (< OE. *lēod*): (*Sir Gaw.*) *depe*, *erpe*, *fel*, *behelde*, *fer*, *hert*, *herken*, *lerne*, etc.; *burne*, *rurd* 'noise', etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *dep*, *derk*, *erle*, *fellen*, *fende*, *hert*, *prest*, *seuen*, *þef*, etc.; *burne*, *furpe*, *vrpe* 'earth', etc. *Myrc* has a few *u*-forms; the MS. is of the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century; it is unusual to find *u*-forms so late as this: *ben*, *frende*, *herken*, *herte*, *leue*, *fer*, *erpe*, *prest*, *werk*, etc.; *vrthe* 'earth', *buth*, *huld*, *duply*, *furþ*, *lurned*, etc. The *Psalter* has no *e*-forms. This is an important point. Though I do not think it sufficient evidence in itself to prove the non-W. Midland character of the text, yet, when considered in combination with other points (see § 25), it is a serious difficulty.

§ 9). *Robt. of Glos.* has *u* usually in *hure* (> OE. *hīeran*), *e* is used in other words: *yflemed*, *ihere*, *herde*, *leue* 'believe', *derne* 'secret', etc. Except for 4 *u*-forms and 5 *i*-forms in *Lazamon*, the other texts have *e*. (*Lazamon*) *fleman*, *heren*, *ileue*, *alesen*, etc.; *hure*, etc. (4); *ihire*, *biliueð*, etc. (6). (*Ancr. Riwe*) *cheping*, *iheren*, *leie* 'flame', *ileueð*, *alesen*, etc. (*Kath. Group*) *alesunge*, *derne*, *heren*, *hersumēð* 'obey', *leuen*, etc., (*Harley Lyrics*) *cheping*, *here*, *yherde*, *leuen*, *derne*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *here*, *herde*, *hersum* 'obedient', *leue*, *derne*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *fleme*, *here*, *leuen*, etc. (*Myrc*) *here*, *herde*, *leue*, *leueth*, etc. The *Psalter* has *e* regularly.

§ 10). OE. *æl* + cons. There are very few traces of forms going back to the OE. fracture type in any of the W. Midl. texts — none at all after the first quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. *Lazamon* has *welden* etc. 6 times (perhaps on the analogy of some part of the verb that has undergone mutation). *hælden* (inf.) twice; *wælden* twice; the regular spellings are *ald*, *old*, for the lengthened, *al* for the unlengthened form: *alle*, *fallen*, *half*, *walle*; *ald*, *bald*, *halden*, *talde*, *walden*; *olde*, *cold*, *holde*, etc. *St. Katherine* has *welden*, etc., twice: but otherwise always *al*. (*Long and Short*) *halue*, *alde*, *halden*, *talde*, etc. *St. Juliana* has *al* (*Long and Short*): *half*, *talde*, *alde*, *baldest*, *halden*, etc. The *Ancr. Riwe* has *helden* once, but usually *al* (*Short*) and *old* (*Long*): *alle*, *uallen*, *falleð*, *half*, *wal*, etc.; *bold*, *cold*, *holden*, *old*, *tolde*, etc. *Robt. of Glos.* has the unfractured type invariably: *alle*, *uallen*, *half*, *salt*, etc. (since this text has *a* for OE, *æ*, these forms might be from OE. *ælle*, etc., > *ealle*, but the lengthened forms do not support this view); *old*, *bold*, *cold*, *holde*, *tolde*, etc. The *Harley Lyrics* have a few fracture-forms:

*elde, selde, helde, telde*, (once each), but otherwise *olde, bolde, cold, holden, solde, told, wold* (N.), etc. The other texts, *Sir Gawayne*, *Allit. Poems*, and *Myrc*, have only unfractured forms. The *Psalter* has a fair number of fracture forms, a larger proportion than any of the texts quoted above.

§ 11). OE. *ear* + cons. The 13<sup>th</sup> century texts have both *er* and *ar*. In the following century *ar* is usual. In *Lazamon* the *er*-type (written *er, ær, ear, eær*) is a little more common than the *ar*-type: *armen, art, hardest, harpen, scarpe, marce*, etc.; *bearn, eart, heard, scearpe, bern, ert, hermes, sterce, ært, hærdere, hærn, scærpe*, etc., *eært, eærd, gearwede*, etc. The *Kath. Group* has *ar* more often than *er*: *art, harm, scharpe, warp, starke, ward, etc.*; *derf, sperke, herde(liche), þerf*, etc. The *Ancr. Riule* has *er* except after *w* (cp. the treatment of OE. *ǣ* in this text, § 4): *ermes, ert, herde, herm, sperke, bearn, earne, heard, schearpe*, etc.; *ward, warnie, upward*, etc. In the later texts, and also in the *Psalter*, *er* is very rare. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *barn, arwe* 'arrow', *arm, art, hard, harm, harpare, narwe, sharpe, warde, warny*, etc.; *ern* 'eagle', *werð*. (*Harley Lyrics*) *carf, arm, art, hard, harm, sharpe, stark, warned, warp*, etc.; *berne, werne*. (*Sir Gawayne*) *armes, art, hard, scharp, warme, warp*, etc.; *erde* 'region', *merk*. (*Allit. Poems*) *arne, art, barn, harde, harpe, scharp, swart, warne*, etc.; *hernes* 'eagles', *ferne, merkkes*.

§ 12). OE. *ēag, ēah*. The ordinary type is *eih, ey; y, yze* is regular in *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems*, but does not appear in the other 14<sup>th</sup> century texts, nor in those of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. *Myrc* has both *egh* and *y*. The *Psalter* has always *eȝ*. (*Lazamon*) *heh, heȝe, neh, hæh, hæȝe, næh; heih, neih, fleih, haihe*, etc. (*Ancr. Riule*), *eie, eien, heih, heie, neih*. (*Harley Lyrics*) *eȝe, eye, eyȝen, heh, heȝe, heȝȝe, neh*, etc. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *eye, heȝe, hey, heimen, neȝ, neȝe, nei*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *yȝe, yȝen, hyȝe, highe, hyȝhe, nie*, etc.; *he, heȝe, neȝ, neȝe*. (*Allit. Poems*) *yȝe, yȝen, hyȝe, hiȝe, nyȝe*, etc. (*Myrc*) *hegh, negh, neghe; ye, yen, hye*.

§ 13). OE. *a* + nasal (Unlengthened). The typical W. Midland form is *o*. This is the type found in *Lazamon*, in the *Kath. Group*, and in the *Ancr. Riule*; *a* is found, though very rarely, in the *Harley Lyrics*, in *Sir Gawayne*, and in *Myrc*; it is a little more common in the *Allit. Poems*. The spelling *a* is, however, the usual one in *Robt. of Glos.*, *o*-forms being few in number. The *Psalter* agrees with the last text in having *a*. (*Lazamon*) *from, gon, mon, moni, nome, scome*, etc. (*Kath. Gr.*) *mon, monie, nome, from, gon*, etc. (*Ancr. Riule*) *from, bigon, mon, moni, nome*, etc. (*Harley Lyrics*) *con, from, gon, bigon, lome* 'lame', *mon, moni, nome, shome*, etc.; *can, man, name, shame*. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *can, gan, man, man, name, ssame, wan, fram*, etc.; *mon, moni*. (*Sir Gawayne*) *mon, mony, nome, schome, ponk, bonk*, etc.; *name, schame, fram*. (*Allit. Poems*) *mon, lone* 'lane', *bonk, mony, nome, ponk*, etc.; *man, name, bigan, schame*, etc. (*Myrc*) *con, from, mon, mony, nome*, etc.; *name, schame*.

§ 14). Ending of 3<sup>rd</sup> Sing. Pres. Ind. Most of the texts have *-eð*. *Lazamon*, *Ancr. Riule*, and the *Kath. Group* have only *-eð*. I have noted 3 *-es* forms in *Robt. of Glos.*, 20 in the *Harley Lyrics*, and about 15 in *Myrc*. *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems* have only *-es*. The *Psalter* has always *-ep*. (*Lazamon*) *abideð, falled, hateð, læsteð, madeð, spekeð*, etc. (*St. Katherine*) *drived, haueð, liued, liked, seið, cumeð*, etc. (*St. Juliana*) *cleopeð, falled, helpeð, leadeð, kepeð, seið*, etc. (*Ancr. Riule*) *asked, doð, madeð, seched, telled, penched*, etc. (*Harley*

*Lyrics*) *arysed*, *biginned*, *bringed*, *buyþ*, *calleþ*, *haþ*, etc.; *drynkes*, *haues*, *likes*, *singes*, *ledes*, etc. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *biginþ*, *deþ*, *drifþ*, *faileþ*, *lokeþ*, *serued*, etc.; *bringz*, as 'has', *me penches*. (*Sir Gawayne*) *abides*, *bigynnes*, *clepes*, *dryues*, *gos*, *haldes*, *kepes*, *rennes*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *askes*, *blyndes*; *calles*, *deles*, *enteres*, *fyndes*, *makes*, etc. (*Myrc*) *bereth*, *goth*, *seyþ*, *waxeth*, *makeþ*, *synnep*, *sendeþ*, etc.; *has*, *telles*, *sendes*, *sayes*, *helpys*, *stondys*, etc.

§ 15). Plural of Pres. Ind. The 13<sup>th</sup> century texts and also *Robt. of Glos.*, have only -*ed*. The Midland -*en* seems to have spread into the west by the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, as the *Harley Lyrics* have a fair number of examples of this; the usual form in this text is -*eþ*. Further north, *Myrc* has (in order of frequency) -*eth*, -*e*, -*en*. *Sir Gawayne* has -*en*, -*e*, and a few -*es* forms. The *Allit. Poems* have about the same number of -*en* forms and -*es* forms, and a few *e*. The *Psalter* has -*en*. (*Lazamon*) *habbed*, *luuied*, *ræded*, *sleoped*, *sceoted*, etc. (*St. Katherine*) *botned*, *cnawed*, *flowed*, *habbed*, *segged*, *wonied*, etc. (*St. Juliana*) *arised*, *doð*, *makied*, *holded*, *findeð*, *liuied*, *gað*, etc. (*Ancr. Riwle*) *blowed*, *god*, *ligged*, *sleped*, *telleð*, *asked*, *singeð*, etc. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *abideþ*, *bileueþ*, *bringeþ*, *doþ*, *findeþ*, *habbeþ*, *setteþ*, etc. (*Myrc*) *brekeþ*, *bydeth*, *renneth*, *techeþ*, *doth*, *holdeth*, *maketh*, etc., *haue*, *holde*, *make*, *here*, *leue*, etc.; *faren*, *sen*, *fallen*, *seyn*, etc. (*Harley Lyrics*) *beodeþ*, *bringeþ*, *clepeþ*, *comeþ*, *goþ*, *kepeþ*, *leoseþ*, *wissheþ*, etc. *beren*, *fallen*, *knowen*, *han*, *waxen*, *wepen*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *callen*, *halden*, *hauen*, *lepen*, *schewen*, *fallen*, *knowen*, etc.; *bere*, *calle*, *grenne*, *lye*, *knowe*, etc.; *beres*, *repayres*, *walkes*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *cachen*, *harpen*, *fasten*, *halden*, *sellen*, *syngen*, *worchen*, etc.; *begynes*, *calles*, *drawes*, *lepes*, *lyuyes*, *synkes*, etc.; *calle*, *habbe*, *schewe*, *slepe*, *take*, etc.

§ 16). Present Participle. The following texts have -*inde*: *Lazamon*, the *Kath. Group*, *Ancr. Riwle*, *Robt. of Glos.*, and the *Harley Lyrics*. The first two have also -*ende*; this ending is rare in the *Kath. Group*, and occurs chiefly in verbs with Infinitive in -*ien*; in *Lazamon* there are 18 examples of -*ende* to 22 of -*inde*; I am inclined to think that -*ende* in this text is a traditional form surviving from Old English, rather than a genuine Middle English, West Midland, dialect form. If this is so, it is possible that the S.W. Midl. -*inde* area passes directly into the -*ande* area of the N.W. Midl. without an intervening dialect with -*ende*. *Mirc* has only -*yng*, but his contemporary, Audelay, (also a Shropshire man), has -*ande*. *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems* have always -*ande*. (*Lazamon*) *berninde*, *farinde*, *liðinde*, *ligginde*, *sichinde* 'seeking', *waldinde*, etc.; *murnende*, *ridende*, *singende*, *weopende*, *wuniende*, etc. (*St. Katherine*) *cneolinde*, *flowinde*, *gleaminde*, *strikinde*, *wepinde*, *glistinde*, etc.; *pleiende*, *wuniende*, *liuiende*, etc. (*St. Juliana*) *cweðinde*, *lihtinde*, *schininde*, *singinde*, *wallinde*, etc.; *heriende*, *liuiende*. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *berninde*, *cominde*, *durinde*, *fleinde*, *goinde*, *wepinde*, etc.; (*Harley Lyrics*) *bringinde*, *haltinde*, *lahynde*, *honginde*, *mournynde*, *wepynde*, etc. (*Ancr. Riwle*) *axinde*, *fallinde*, *gederinde*, *kneolinde*, *prikinde*, *schininde*, *sittinde*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *claterande*, *driuande*, *glydande*, *standande*, *goande*, *herande*, *rennande*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *brennande*, *dawande*, *flytande*, *glemande*, *haldande*, *raynande*, *synkande*, etc.

§ 17). Feminine Pronoun. The 13<sup>th</sup> century texts have *heo*, *ha*, (the latter presumably unstressed) for the nominative case. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, *heo* is still the usual form in the more southern texts; the northern ones, *Sir Gawayne*, etc., have *ho*. *Myrc*, between the two groups, has both *heo* and *ho*, together with a few examples of *scho*; I have noted one example



of the latter form in the *Allit. Poems*, five in *Gawayne* (to 35 *ho*), and one in *Robt. of Glos.* sso. The form *he* is rare; it occurs a few times in the *Harley Lyrics*, once in *Robt. of Glos.* The only *she* form is in *Robt. of Glos.*: *sse* (once). The genitive and dative are both *hire* in all the texts.

	NOM.	GEN.	DAT.
<i>Lazamon</i>	heo (ho <i>once</i> )	hir	hire
<i>St. Juliana</i>	ha, heo	hir	hire
<i>St. Katherine</i>	ha, heo	hire	hire
<i>Ancr. Riwle</i>	heo	hire	hire
<i>Robt. of Glos.</i>	heo, ȝo	hire	hire
<i>Harl. Lyrics</i>	heo, (he, hue)	hire	hire
<i>Sir Gawayne</i>	ho, (scho)	hir	hir
<i>Allit. Poems</i>	ho	hyr	hyr
<i>Myrc</i>	heo, ho, scho	hyre	hyre

§ 18). Plural Pronoun. The 13<sup>th</sup> century forms of the nominative are *heo* and *ha*. The *Harley Lyrics* have *hue* and *heo* and occasionally *he*. *Robt. of Glos.* (from the south of the area under discussion) has *hii*. *Myrc*, *Sir Gawayne*, and the *Allit. Poems*, have only *ȝay*. This seems to be the ordinary form in the N. W. Midl. from the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards, as it appears also in such texts as the *Ireland MS.*, *St. Erkenwald*, the *Alisaunder Fragments*, and *William of Palerne*; the same texts agree in having *-es* for the 3rd Sing. Pres. of verbs, *-and* for the Pres. Participle, and, except for *W. of Palerne*, *ho* for the fem. sing. nom. The genitive forms vary considerably; the most common are *hore*, *heore*, *here*. For the dative, the 13<sup>th</sup> century texts have *heom*, *ham*. *Hem* is the usual form in the *Harley Lyrics*, *Sir Gawayne*, (also *hom*), *Allit. Poems*, and *Myrc*; *hom* is used in *Robt. of Glos.* together with a few examples of *hem*.

	NOM.	GEN.	DAT.
<i>Lazamon</i>	heo	heore	heom
<i>St. Juliana</i>	ha, heo	hare	ham
<i>St. Katherine</i>	ha, heo	hare	ham
<i>Ancr. Riwle</i>	heo	hore	ham
<i>Robt. of Glos.</i>	hii	hor	hom, (hem)
<i>Harl. Lyrics</i>	hue, heo, he	huere, here	hem, huem
<i>Sir Gawayne</i>	ȝay	her, hor	hem, hom
<i>Allit. Poems</i>	ȝay	her	hem
<i>Myrc</i>	ȝey	here	hem

§ 19). Plural of the verb 'be'. This test divides the W. Midl. into three areas: a) a southern district with *beoð*, *beð*; b) a central district with *ben*, *beð*; c) a northern district with *arn*, *ar*. The last type is used also in *St. Erkenwald*, the *Ireland MS.*, etc. a) (*Lazamon*) *beoð*, *beð*; (*St. Katherine*) *beoð*; (*St. Juliana*) *beoð*; (*Ancr. Riwle*) *beoð*; (*Harley Lyrics*) *bueð*, *beð*, *beoð*; (*Robt. of Glos.*) *bep*. b) (*Myrc*) *ben*, *bep*. c) (*Sir Gawayne*) *ar*, (*arn* twice), (*Allit. Poems*) *arn*, *ar*, *ben*.

§ 20). Past Participle. *Robt. of Glos.* has the prefix *i-*, and no *-n* suffix; this is the usual southern form. Further north, *Lazamon*, *St. Juliana*, *St. Katherine*, *Ancr. Riwle*, have the prefix *i*, and retain *-n*. The *Harley Lyrics* have a variety of forms; the forms with *i-* are rather less common

than those without, and the ending *-e* is more common than *-en*. When *i-* is used, it is generally in conjunction with *-e*, not *-en*. The *i* prefix is fairly often found in *Myrc*; there are about as many forms with the prefix as without it; the use of *i-* so far north may be partly due to the spread of the London dialect. The ending *-e* is the regular type in *Myrc*, but *-en* appears pretty often. *Sir Gawayne* and the *Allit. Poems* never have *i-*, and always have *-en*.

(*Lazamon*) *iboren*, *ikoren*, *idrawen*, *ifunden*, *itaken*, *iwexan*, etc. (*St. Juliana*) *ibeden*, *iboren*, *ibroken*, *ibunden*, *icumen*, *iloren*, etc. (*St. Katherine*) *ibroken*, *icorne*, *isehen*, *iboren*, *ichosen*, *islein*, etc. (*Ancr. Riwe*) *ibroken*, *icumen*, *ivallen*, *iwrten*, *iholden*, *ispeken*, etc. (*Harley Lyrics*) *bete*, *bore*, *bounde*, *come*, *drawe*, *dryue*, *holde*, etc.; *ycome*, *yfounde*, *yholde*, *yknowe*, *ilore*, *ynome*, etc.; *bounden*, *broken*, *founden*, *faren*, *writen*, etc.; *ybeten*, *ycoren*, *yholden*, *ypryuen*, etc. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *icome*, *iflowe*, *ihote*, *ivalle*, *ystonde*, *iwrite*, *iwonne*, *islawe*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *boden*, *bounden*, *comen*, *coruon*, *drawen*, *fallen*, *nomen*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *byten*, *broken*, *dryuen*, *fallen*, *flowen*, *grauen*, *spoken*, etc. (*Myrc*) *ibore*, *iborste*, *inome*, *itake*, *ispoke*, *ylore*, etc.; *iholpen*, *iseyn*, *ispoken*, *ilayn*, etc.; *come*, *dronke*, *loke*, etc., *wryte*, *holpe*, etc.; *dronken*, *wryten*, *slayn*, *eten*, *spoken*, etc.

§ 21). Infinitive. The regular ending in the 13<sup>th</sup> century is *-en*. In the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries *-e* is usual, but *-en* appears more or less frequently in all the texts except *Robt. of Glos.* The ending *-i* is fairly common in *Robt. of Glos.* but it hardly ever appears in the other texts. (*Lazamon*) *blawan*, *comen*, *driuen*, *fallen*, *libben*, *maken*, etc. (*St. Juliana*) *acwellen*, *bernen*, *biginnen*, *finden*, *bringen*, *cumen*, *habben*, etc. (*St. Katherine*) *arisen*, *bringen*, *halden*, *helpen*, *bidden*, *heren*, *stonden*, etc. (*Ancr. Riwe*) *carien*, *deien*, *liggen*, *onswerien*, *delen*, *loken*, *siggen*, etc.; (*Harley Lyrics*) *abuggen*, *cheosen*, *faren*, *helpen*, *leten*, etc.; *abide*, *aryse*, *biseche*, *blesse*, *calle*, *come*, *folewe*, *fynde*, *make*, *telle*, etc. (*Robt. of Glos.*) *bidde*, *bringe*, *burie*, *crie*, *drawe*, *finde*, *hele*, *libbe*, *loke*, *teche*, etc.; *aski*, *crouni*, *hongi*, *lerni*, *warni*, *wondri*, etc. (*Sir Gawayne*) *abide*, *bite*, *chose*, *deme*, *falle*, *haue*, *knowe*, etc.; *last*, *hunt*, *ryd*, *sett*, *worch*, etc.; *asken*, *chepen*, *driuen*, *hyden*, *seruen*, etc. (*Allit. Poems*) *aske*, *byde*, *blowe*, *calle*, *cnawe*, *deme*, *pulle*, etc.; *ask*, *com*, *fech*, *help*, *wyrk*, *penk*, etc.; *gon*, *helpen*, *lysten*, *wryten*, *leuen*, etc.

§ 22. The details given in the preceding paragraphs seem to divide the W. Midl. texts into two groups; a) a Northern Group, characterised by: 1) *a* always for OE. *ǣ*; 2) [ē] for *ǣ*<sup>1</sup>; 3) [ē] for *ǣ*<sup>2</sup>; 4) *i*, (*u*), for *ȳ*; 5) *e*, (*u*), for *ĕo*; 6) *e* for the *i* mutation of *ǣa*; 7) no fracture of *ǣ* before *l* + cons.; 8) *ar*, (*er*), for *ear* + cons.; 9) *ȳ*, (*egh*), for *ēag*, *ēah*; 10) *o* for OE. *a* + nasal (unlengthened); 11) *-es* for 3<sup>rd</sup> Sing. Pres.; 12) *-en*, *-es*, and *-eð* for Pres. Plural; 13) *-ande* for Present Participle; 14) *ho* for Nom. Sing. of Feminine Pronoun; 15) *þay* — *hor*, *her* — *hom*, *hem* for Plural Pronoun; 16) *ar(n)*, *ben*, for Pl. of 'be'; 17) *-en* for P.P. suffix; 18) *-e* for ending of Infinitive. This group comprises *Myrc*, *Sir Gaw.*, *Allit. Pms.*

b) a Southern Group, characterised by: 1) *e* in 13<sup>th</sup> century, *a*, *e*, in 14<sup>th</sup> century, for OE. *ǣ*; 2) [ē] for *ǣ*<sup>1</sup>; 3) [ē] for *ǣ*<sup>2</sup>; 4) *u* for *ȳ*; 5) *e*, *u*, for *ĕo*; 6) *e*, (*u* also in *R. of Glos.*), for *ǣa-i*; 7) fracture of *ǣ* before *l* + cons., very rare, only doubtful cases; 8) *ar*, (*er*), (in 14<sup>th</sup> cent.), for *ear* + cons.; 9) *egh*, *ey* for *ēag*, *ēah*; 10) *o* for *a* + nasal (unlengthened); 11) *-eþ* for 3<sup>rd</sup> Sing. Pres.; 12) *-eð*, *-en*, for Plur. Pres.; 13) *-inde* for Pres. Part.; 14) *heo* for Fem. Pronoun, Nom.; 15) *heo*, *hue*, for Nom. of Plur. Pronoun, (except

## § 23.

		E. E. PR. PS.	ROBT. OF GLOS.	ANCREN RIWLE	ST. JULIANA	ST. KATHERINE	LAȜAMON (A)	HARLEY LYRICS	MIRK. INSTRUC.	ALLIT. POEMS	SIR GAWAYNE
1.	OE <i>ǣ</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i> ( <i>a</i> after <i>w</i> )	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a, æ / e</i>	<i>a, e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>
2.	<i>ǣ</i> <sup>1</sup>	[ <i>ē</i> ]	<i>e</i> (short <i>a</i> )	<i>e, ea</i>	<i>e (ea)</i>	<i>e, ea</i>	[ <i>ē</i> ], [ <i>e</i> ]	<i>e</i> (short : <i>e, a</i> )	<i>e</i>	[ <i>ē</i> ]	[ <i>ē</i> ]
3.	<i>ǣ</i> <sup>2</sup>	[ <i>ē</i> ]	<i>e</i> (short <i>a</i> )	<i>e, ea</i>	<i>ea / e</i>	<i>ea, e</i>	[ <i>ē</i> ]	<i>e</i> (short : <i>a</i> )	<i>e</i> [short : <i>a</i> ]	[ <i>ē</i> ]	[ <i>ē</i> ]
4.	<i>ȳ</i>	<i>i, (u, e)</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i> ( <i>i</i> sometimes before <i>n</i> )	<i>i, u</i>	<i>i, u, (e)</i>	<i>i, u, e</i>
5.	<i>ě o</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e, u</i>	<i>eo</i>	<i>eo</i>	<i>eo, o</i>	<i>eo, e, (u, o)</i>	<i>e, eo, ue, (u)</i>	<i>e (u)</i>	<i>e (u)</i>	<i>e (u)</i>
6.	<i>ě a + i</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>u, e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
7.	<i>ǣ l + cons.</i>	<i>old (eld)</i>	<i>-old</i>	<i>al - old</i>	<i>al</i>	<i>al</i>	<i>al (æ l)</i>	<i>old</i>	<i>-old</i>	<i>old, ald</i>	<i>ald, old</i>
8.	<i>ear + cons.</i>	<i>ar, (er)</i>	<i>ar</i>	<i>er, ear, ar</i>	<i>ar (er)</i>	<i>ar (er)</i>	<i>ar, ear, ær, er</i>	<i>ar</i>	<i>ar</i>	<i>ar</i>	<i>ar (er)</i>
9.	<i>ē ag, ē ah</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ey</i>	<i>eih</i>	<i>eh</i>	<i>eh</i>	<i>eh</i>	<i>eȝ, -eh</i>	<i>-egh, (-y)</i>	<i>ȝȝ (eȝ)</i>	<i>ȝȝ, (eȝ)</i>
10.	<i>a + nasal</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>an, am</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o (a)</i>	<i>o (a)</i>	<i>o</i>
11.	3 <sup>rd</sup> s. pres.	<i>-eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>-eð (es)</i>	<i>-eð (-es)</i>	<i>-es</i>	<i>-es</i>
12.	Plur. pres.	<i>-en</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>eð</i>	<i>-eð</i>	<i>-eð, -en</i>	<i>-eð, -en/-e</i>	<i>-es, -en, (-e)</i>	<i>-en, -e, -es</i>
13.	Pres. Part.	<i>-and</i>	<i>-inde</i>	<i>-inde (-ende)</i>	<i>-inde, -ende</i>	<i>-inde (-ende)</i>	<i>-inde (-ende)</i>	<i>-ynde</i>	<i>-ynge</i>	<i>-ande</i>	<i>-ande</i>
14.	Fem. Pron.	<i>she - hir</i>	<i>heo, ȝo - hire hire</i>	<i>heo - hire - hire</i>	<i>ha, heo-hire-hire</i>	<i>ha, heo-hire-hire</i>	<i>heo-hir-hire</i>	<i>heo, he, hue—hire—hire</i>	<i>heo, ho, scho — hyre—hyre</i>	<i>ho - hir, her - hir</i>	<i>ho (scho) -hir -hir</i>
15.	Plur. Pron.	<i>hij - her - hem</i>	<i>hii - hor - hom</i>	<i>heo - hore - ham</i>	<i>ha, heo - hare, ham</i>	<i>ha (heo)-hire-ham</i>	<i>heo-heore-heom</i>	<i>hue, heo, hii—huere, here—hem, huem</i>	<i>ȝey, here, hem</i>	<i>ȝay - her - hem</i>	<i>ȝay—her, hor—hem, hom</i>
16.	Plur. of 'be'	<i>ben</i>	<i>beȝ</i>	<i>beoȝ</i>	<i>beoð</i>	<i>beoð</i>	<i>beoȝ, beȝ</i>	<i>bueȝ, buen</i>	<i>ben, beth, (ar/arn)</i>	<i>arn, ar, ben</i>	<i>ar, (arn, ben)</i>
17.	P.P.	<i>-en. i - very rare</i>	<i>-e; i-</i>	<i>-en; i-</i>	<i>-en. i-</i>	<i>-en. i-</i>	<i>-en, i-</i>	<i>-e i- -en No i-</i>	<i>-e, -en. -i, no i-</i>	<i>-en No i-</i>	<i>-en No i</i>
18.	Infinitive.	<i>-en, -e</i>	<i>-en, -e</i>	<i>-en, (-e, -i)</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>-en, (-e, -i)</i>	<i>-e, -en</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-e (-en)</i>	<i>-e, -en</i>





*R. of Glos.*, which has *hii*); 16) *beoð, beð*, for Plur. of 'be'; 17) P.P. sometimes with *i* prefix, and with suffix *-en* or *-e*; 18) 13<sup>th</sup> cent. *-en*, 14<sup>th</sup> cent. *-e*, for ending of Infinitive.

### Psalter contrasted with W. Midland Texts.

§ 23) The *Psalter* agrees with the Northern Group in Nos. 3, 6, 8, 13, 17, and disagrees with it in Nos. 1, 2, 4, (*u* being even less common in the *Psalter* than in the N.W. texts), 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18.<sup>1)</sup> This long list of points of disagreement is, perhaps, enough to make the assignment of the *Psalter* to a N.W. area a matter of extreme difficulty.

To turn to the Southern Group: the *Psalter* agrees with this in Nos. 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, and disagrees with it in Nos. 4, 5, 7 (fracture forms being better established in the *Psalter*), 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. In this case, the points of agreement are rather more numerous than in the case of the Northern Group, but disagreement in such distinctive characters as Nos. 4, 5, 10, 13, and 14, are most unsatisfactory if we are to regard the *Psalter* as being in a western dialect. The text agrees with *R. of Glos.* against the rest of the S.W. Midl. group in Nos. 10 and 15, but Nos. 6, 12, 13, 16, and 17, would prevent our assigning the *Psalter* to an area so far to the south, even if the two texts agreed in other ways.

Thus the dialect of the *Psalter* does not agree with that of the W. Midl. in any one of the distinctively W. Midland features — the treatment of OE. *y* and of OE. *eo*, the occurrence of *on* for OE. *a* + nasal, the use of the fem. pronoun *ho, heo*, and of the Plural Pron. (Dat.) *hom*, and the absence of fracture of OE. *æ*l + cons. In the comparative table in § 26 these differences of dialect can be seen distinctly.

§ 24) If we can trust the dialect tests applied above, the dialect of the *Psalter* is clearly not W. Midl. This would be a more satisfactory statement if we knew the exact area in which W. Midl. dialects were spoken. How far east does W. Midl. extend? Where is the boundary between it and the East Midland? Or is there a distinct Central Midland Dialect lying between the two? These questions are difficult to answer, as there are no literary texts that are definitely known to have been written in the Central and Southern Midlands earlier than the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The Coventry Leet Book and the English Registers of Godstow and Oseney are of the greatest value for the study of Early Modern English, but they are too late and too much influenced by Standard English to be of much assistance in determining the chief features of the dialects of Warwick and Oxford a hundred years earlier. We have to rely mainly on Place-Name evidence, and from this, valuable as it is for phonological facts, it is obviously impossible to gain information about inflections, with the exception of the endings of the Present Participle, which sometimes occurs in Field Names.

§ 25) Perhaps the most distinctively western feature in the texts we have already discussed is the use of *u* as well as *e* for OE *eo*. This type appears in Place Names from Hereford, Worcs., certainly part of Oxford, S. W. Bucks, W. Surrey, and all the counties west of these.<sup>2)</sup> There are

<sup>1)</sup> See comparative table.

<sup>2)</sup> See my article in *English Studies*, Oct. 1922.

also very slight traces of *u* for  $\ddot{e}o$  in Warwick and Stafford. We may venture to say quite roughly that *u* for *eo* is not found east of a line drawn from Dorking to Birmingham. It is at least probable that the *Psalter* is from a district east of this line. Place Names of the counties west of the same line are characterised also by a consistent use of *u* for OE. *y* (cf. § 7); this is another reason for not assigning the *Psalter* to this area. The same difficulty applies to Warwick, Bucks., Beds., and Herts. (see Professor Wyld's article on OE.  $\ddot{y}$  in *Englische Studien*, Vol. 47, and that on the South Eastern dialects in *Essays and Studies*, Vol. 6). Warwick is excluded also by the ending of the Pres. Participle: *-ande* in the *Psalter*, *-inde* in Warwickshire Place Names; I have noted in the Catalogue of Ancient Deeds: *le Fallyndedoune* (Vol. iii, p. 76), *Honginde lond* (ii, pp. 306, 307), *Hokinde Stret* (Vol. i, p. 287), etc. On the other hand, we cannot put the *Psalter* very far to the east, by reason of the small number of *e* forms for OE. *y*; this excludes Essex, Suffolk, and Cambridge (*Englische Studien*, 47, pp. 28-30). Suffolk is impossible also on account of the tense [ $\bar{e}$ ] for  $\bar{a}^3$  which is a feature of the dialect of that county (*Essays and Studies*, p. 117). Hunts. has *u* for *y* too rarely, and is also outside the area which had [ $\bar{e}$ ] for  $\bar{a}^1$  (Brandl, *Zur Geographie der altenglischen Dialekte*). Leics. is too far to the north to show any traces of fracture of  $\bar{a}$  before *l* + cons. (*English Studies*, June 1922). We are left with Northamptonshire, and this is, I believe, the only county to which the *Psalter* can be assigned with any show of probability.

### **Psalter agrees with Peterborough Chronicle and Northants Pl. Ns.**

§ 26) In the case of Northants., we have fortunately an English document to supplement the Place Name evidence. The *Peterborough Chronicle*, though nearly two hundred years earlier, agrees with the *Psalter* in a striking manner. The accompanying table gives a comparison of the two texts. An analysis of the dialect of the *Chronicle*, or rather of the final portion, from the year 1122 to the end of the MS., will be found on p. 195. The earlier part, which is all in the same hand (see p. 250 of the *Chron.*), shows very little change from the standard W. Saxon; the later part has many typical M.E. features.

§ 27) The agreement between the *Psalter* and the *Chronicle* is fairly clear. The dialect of each seems to be neither distinctively W. Midl. nor distinctively E. Midl. The dialect of the *Psalter* certainly has a closer resemblance to that of the *Chron.* than to that of any of the W. Midl. documents. Allowing for chronological differences, the two texts agree in the following points: 1, probably 2 and 3 (though it is doubtful what value  $\bar{a}^1$  and  $\bar{a}^3$  had in the dialect of the *Chronicle*), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. The difference in No. 13, the ending of the Pres. Part., is probably also chronological; the *-ende* of the *Chronicle* may well be a survival of the OE. form. It may seem hazardous to suggest that *-ande* was the regular Northamptonshire Pres. Part. ending, particularly since the dialect of the adjoining county of Warwick seems to have had *-inde* (§ 25); I have noted two Northants. Place Names containing a Pres. Participle: *Hengandelyes* (Calendar of Inquisitions, Vol. i, p. 193) 1265; *Hengandelley*, 147 (1262); it is satisfactory to observe that these have *-ande*; the northern ending is clearly not impossible in this county.



## § 26.

		CHRONICLE	PSALTER	W. MIDL. NTHN. GROUP	W. MIDL. STHN. GROUP
1.	OE. $\tilde{a}$ .	<i>a, æ, e</i>	<i>a, (e)</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e, a</i>
2.	$\bar{a}$ .	<i>e, a, æ</i>	<i>e (a shortened)</i>	$[\bar{e}]$	$[\bar{e}]$
3.	$\bar{æ}$ .	<i>e, æ</i>	<i>e (a shortened)</i>	$[\dot{e}]$	$[\bar{e}]$
4.	$\tilde{y}$ .	<i>i, (e)</i>	<i>i, (u, e)</i>	<i>i (u)</i>	<i>u</i>
5.	$\tilde{eo}$ .	<i>e, (eo)</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e (u)</i>	<i>e, u</i>
6.	<i>i</i> mutation of $\tilde{ea}$ .	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
7.	$\bar{æ}$ before <i>l</i> + cons.	<i>al, eal, æl</i>	<i>old, (eld)</i>	<i>al, old</i>	<i>al, old</i>
8.	<i>ear</i> + cons.	<i>ær, ar</i>	<i>ar, (er)</i>	<i>ar, (er)</i>	<i>ar, (er)</i>
9.	$\bar{e}ag, \bar{e}ah$ .	<i>eh, eg</i>	<i>e<sub>3</sub></i>	$\bar{y}$ ( <i>egh</i> )	<i>egh, ey</i>
10.	<i>a</i> + nasal (short)	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>on</i>	<i>on</i>
11.	3 <sup>rd</sup> S. Pres.	<i>-ap</i>	<i>-ep</i>	<i>-es</i>	<i>eð</i>
12.	Plur. Pres.	<i>-en</i>	<i>-en</i>	<i>-en, -es, -eð</i>	<i>-eð, -en</i>
13.	Pres. Part.	<i>-end</i>	<i>-and</i>	<i>-and</i>	<i>-inde</i>
14.	Fem. Pronoun.	<i>scæ hire hire</i>	<i>she hir</i>	<i>ho</i>	<i>heo</i>
15.	Plural Pron.	<i>hi here heom</i>	<i>hij her hem</i>	<i>þay — hor, her — hom, hem</i>	<i>heo, hue — hare, h(e)ore, — hom, hem</i>
16.	Plur. of 'be'.	<i>beon</i>	<i>ben</i>	<i>ar(n), ben</i>	<i>be(o)ð</i>
17.	Past Part.	<i>-en. i- rare.</i>	<i>-en. i- rare.</i>	<i>-en. No i-</i>	<i>-en, -e. i-. (sometimes)</i>
18.	Infinitive.	<i>-en</i>	<i>-en, -e</i>	<i>-e</i>	<i>-en, -e</i>



§ 28). With regard to No. 4 — OE. *y*, — it is possible that the difference between the *Chronicle* and the *Psalter* is due to their belonging to different parts of the county. Northants. extends from Lincoln (a pure *i*-county) to Warwick, Oxford and Bucks. Peterborough itself is in the N.E. corner, on the borders of Cambridge and Hunts., and only a few miles from Lincolnshire. In this part of the county one would expect *i*-forms to be in the majority. The dialect of the *Psalter* may be that of a district further south, perhaps somewhere in the neighbourhood of Wellingborough. I regret that my Place-Name material for Northants. is not plentiful enough to prove the existence of two distinct areas within the county — an *i*-area and an *u*-area. The evidence seems to point in this direction. For instance, in the Selden Society's *Coroner's Rolls* (1302-1323), the name Pattishall is always written *Pateshulle*; the place is a few miles S.W. of Northampton. Orlingbury, not far from Wellingborough, appears as *Orlingbere*. The remaining names have *i*: *Thirneby* (mod. Thornby, near Naseby); *Rysshton* (mod. Rushton, N.W. of Kettering); *Crowethorpbirgge*, *Childerbrigge*, *Fulpyt*, all near Oundle. All the *i*-forms are from the northern half of the county. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century I have noted *Riston* (10 examples), *Ruston* (twice), in the Forest Pleas (Selden Soc.); the Lincoln *Liber Antiquus* (1209-1235) has *Pateshulle* and *Muleton* (Pattishall and Milton, S. of Northampton).

§ 29). It is interesting to find that the forms in the *Psalter* and the *Chronicle* showing fracture of *æ* before *l* + cons. are supported by similar forms in the early Pl. N. material; e.g. *Chelveston* (OE. *cealf*) Feudal Aids, iv, p. 14, (1284); *Chaldenhull* (OE. *ceald*) Catalogue of ancient deeds, Vol. ii, p. 381 (1362). The *Psalter* has one example of *wille* 'spring' (usual form *welle*), possibly from OE. *wielle*; Northants. seems rather too far north for this type, and I am not convinced that the form is genuine. It may be merely a coincidence that the Pl. N. Maidwell, 6 or 7 miles south of Market Harborough, appears occasionally in M.E. records as *Maydewille*, e.g. Forest Pleas pp. 28, 29, 35, etc.

§ 30). A good deal of the evidence presented in the preceding paragraphs is merely negative. All that can be said at present about the dialect of the *Psalter* is that it resembles the western dialects considerably less than it resembles those of Northants. And although this fact may not be convincing proof of the Northamptonshire origin of the *Psalter*, there does not seem to be any very definite evidence against this. Perhaps such evidence will appear as a result of a minuter investigation of the dialects of the Central Midlands. Until our knowledge of M.E. dialects is more detailed, we dare not make a positive statement about the place of origin of any Middle English text.



## Abbreviations.

PSALTER.	'The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter'. ed. Büllbring, EETS. 97.
WELLS.	J. E. Wells: 'A Manual of Writings in Middle English'.
ALLIT. POEMS.	'Early English Alliterative Poems', ed. Morris. EETS. 1.
ANCR. RIWLE.	ed. Morton, Camden Society.
CHRONICLE.	Peterborough Chronicle, from MS. Laud 636, ed. Earle and Plummer: 'Two of the Saxon Chronicles parallel'
HARLEY LYRICS.	Böddeker: 'Altenglische Dichtungen' (MS. Harley 2253).
KATH. GROUP.	'St. Katherine', ed. Einenkel, EETS. 80. 'St. Juliana', ed. Cockayne, EETS. 51.
LAZAMON.	'Lazamon's Brut', ed. Sir F. Madden.
MYRC.	'Instructions for Parish Priests', ed. Peacock, EETS. 31.
ROBT. OF GLOS.	Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, Rolls Series.
SIR GAWAYNE.	'Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight', ed. Morris, EETS. 4.

## EARLIEST COMPLETE ENGLISH PROSE PSALTER.

(Analysis of the dialect).

References to Psalm and Verse.<sup>1)</sup>1. OE. *ǣ*.

- e* forms: OE. *ǣfter*: *efter*: 5/12; 7/9; 9/25; 11/9; 17/23,27; 19/4; etc. *efterwardes*: 15/3.
- a* forms: OE. *ǣfter*: *after* 7/9; 18. OE. *ǣppel*: *appel*: 16/9. OE. *fæder*: *fader* 2/3,6,7; 26/16. *fadres* 38/17. *fader(les)* 9/38. OE. *fæt*: *fatt* 22/7. *fatnes* 21/31. OE. *glæd*: *gladnes(se)* 29/14; 31/9. OE. *hwæt*: *what* 8/5; 9/36; 10/3; 26/2; 29/11; 38/6. OE. *sæt*: *sat* 1/1. *satt* 25/4. OE. *spæc*: *spak* 38/5; 39/8; 40/6,7. OE. *þæt*: *that* 14/6. *þat* (passim). OE. *wæs*: *was* 1/2; 12/4; 34/15,17; 36/26; 40/10; *nas* 13/9; 36/38. OE. *wæter*: *water* 17/13; 22/2. *waters* 1/3; 17/17; 28/3; 32/7.

2. OE. *ǣ*<sup>1</sup>.

- a* forms (shortened): OE. *drædan*: *drad* 54/22; 63/9; 77/58. *adrad* 76/3. *dradde* 118/161; Ps. Abakuk 1. OE. *nǣddre*: *naddres* 139/3.
- e* forms (shortened) OE. *nǣddre*: *nedders* 13/5.
- e* forms (unshortened): OE. *ǣfen*: *even* 29/6. OE. *ǣton*: *eten* 21/31; 40/10. OE. *dǣd*: *dedes* 26/9; 36/19. OE. *drǣd*: *drede* 33/11; 34/30; 35/1. OE. *drǣdan*: *drede* 13/7; 26/2; 5; 32/8; 34/4. *dreden* 34/29. OE. *hǣr*: *heres* 39/17. OE. *sǣd*: *sede* 17/54; 21/23; 32; 24/14; 36/26,27,30. OE. *slǣpan*: *slepe* 4/9. *slepeþ* 40/9. OE. *spǣce*: *speeches* 18/3. OE. *spǣcon*: *speken* 37/13. OE. *strǣt*: *stretes* 17/46. OE. *wǣre*: *were* 3/7; 33/10; 34/15; *wereh* 37/2; 38/17.

3. OE. *ǣ*<sup>2</sup>.

- a* forms: OE. *lǣden*: *lade* (Inf.) 5/9; 7/5; 30/4,5. *lad* 17/22; 22/3, 29/3; 39/2; 77/16,17,58,59,78; 80/9; 104/35,41; 105/9; 106/7,14,27,29; 135/11. *ladde* 21/15; 42/3; PS. Moysi 14. *laddest* 60/3; 65/10,11; 70/22; 72/23. *ladest* 43/13. *ladden* 42/3; 118/136; 137/3,4. OE. *lǣfan*: *laft* 105/11. *bilafst* 9/38. OE. *sprǣdan*: *sprad* 77/50; 79/12; 105/32; 142/6; PS. Moysi 16. *spradden* 139/6. *sprade* (P.P.) 92/9.

<sup>1)</sup> Complete references are given for pp. 1 to 50.

*e* forms: OE. *æfre*: *euer* 26/7. *euermore* 39/22. OE. *āræran*: *arere* 26/6; 40/11. OE. *clæne*: *clene* 18/13; 23/4. *clenness(e)* 17/23,27; 36/39. OE. *hælan*: *hele* 6/2; 40/4. OE. *hwæte*: *whete* 4/8. OE. *lædan*: *lede* 36/6. OE. *læran*: *lered* 2/10. OE. *næfre*: *neuer* 36/26; 38/10. OE. *sæ*: *se* 8/8; *see* 8/8; 32/7. *sees* 23/1. OE. *tæcan*: *teche* 17/39; 24/4,5,10; 33/11. *techeþ* 17/37. *techyng* 25/5. *techynges* 32/2.

#### 4. OE. *ȝ*.

*u* forms: OE. *fȝr*: *fur* 10/7; 11/7; 16/4; 17/10; 14,33; 20/9; 28/6; 38/4; 45/9; 49/4; 57/9; 65/9,11; 67/2; 73/8; 77/17,25,53,69; 78/5; 79/17; etc. OE. (ge)*mȝnd*: *mund* 9/7. OE. *hyll*: *hulles* 113/6. OE. *ȝyrst*: *ȝrust*. 106/32.

*e* forms: OE. *byrigels*: *beriels* 87/5. OE. *fyrst*: *frest* 88/27. OE. (ge)*cȝnd*: *kende* 99/5. OE. *hȝdan*: *hed* 31/1. OE. *hyll*: *helles* PS. Abakuk 10. OE. *scyttan*: *shette* 77/55. *shetten* 16/11. *shettest* 30/10. OE. *wyrst*: *werst* 33/21. OE. *yfel*: *euel* 7/4; 9/35.

*i* forms: OE. *bycȝan*: *bigge* 43/28; 54/20. *bigen* 33/22. *bige* 48/15. *biggeþ* 48/7. (oȝain)*byer* 18/16. OE. *byrgan*: *birie* 78/3. OE. *byrigels*: *biriel* 13/5. *biriels* 48/10; 67/7. OE. *bysig*: *bisi* 39/23. OE. (ge)*cȝnd*: *kinde* 76/8; 79/12. *kynde* 9/28; 21/33; 32/11; 48/11; 20; 59/8; 60/6; 70/20; 73/3; 76/8; 77/4,11,76; 78/10,15; 79/15. *kindes* 77/61; 79/9. *kyndes* 71/5, 18. OE. *dryge*: *drien* (vb.) 36/2. *dry(hede)* 65/5. OE. *fyllan*: *fylland* 64/11. *fild* 16/17; 21/27; 77/33. *filden* 78/1; (ful)*fillen* 15/11. (ful)*fyl* 16/6. (ful)*fild* 16/16; 25/10; 36/20; 37/7; 64/5,10,12,13; 68/40; 70/9; 73/21; 79/10. (ful)*fylde* 62/6. OE. *fyrst*: *first* 77/56. OE. *gyldan*: *gildan* 44/11. OE. *gyrdan*: *girded* 44/4. *girt* 17/35; 64/7. OE. *hrycȝ*: *rigge* 68/28. *rygge* 43/12; 49/18; 65/10; 69/4. *riggen* 17/44. *a rigge* 20/12. OE. *hȝdan*: *hiden* 30/24; 55/6. *hideþ* 18/7. *hid* 9/16; 16/16; 26/9; 31/5; 34/9; 37/9; 54/13; 77/4. *hyd* 39/13. *hidynges* 43/23. OE. *hyll*: *hyl* 2/6. *hill* 14/1. *hille* 4/8. OE. *lȝtel*: *litel* 36/10. *lytel* 16/16; 36/17. *littel* 18/8; 41/8; 74/8. *lyttel* 8/6. *litelhede* 54/8. OE. (ge)*mȝnd*: *mynde* 29/4; 33/16; 76/5. OE. *styrian*: *stiren* 28/7. *stir* 35/12. *stired* 9/36; 12/5; 14/7; 15/8; 16/6; 20/7; 29/7; 37/17; 45/5; 6; 47/5; 59/2; 72/2; 76/18; 77/6,71. *styred* 2/13; 9/28; 17/9; 67/9. *stireing* 43/15. OE. *synn*: *sinne* 8/3; 9/39; 58/4; *synne* 9/12,15,33; 24/12; 29/3,11; 31/2,6; 39/10; 50/4; 54/26,27; 59/3,4; 67/34. *sinȝe* 37/19. *synȝe* 68/2,18,22. *syne* 38/18. *sinnes* 58/2. *synnes* 2/3; 9/34; 16/11; 25/9; 31/1,8; 50/6,10; 57/9. *sinȝes* (corrected from *sunes*) 71/42. *synȝes* 37/3; 38/13; 73/3; 78/9. *sinner* 9/37. *synner* 9/25; 38/17. *sinȝer* 9/17; 35/12; 36/35. *synȝer* 9/24,27,39; 36/12,34; 38/2; 57/10; 70/5. *sinniers* 1/6. *sinȝers* 54/2; 74/10. *sinȝeres* 1/1; 3/7. *synners* 1/7; 9/18. *synȝers* 10/2,7; 27/3; 33/21; 36/14,18,20,35,42; 57/3; 67/2; 72/3,12 (*y* corrected from *u*); 74/8. *synȝeres* 7/10. *sinful* 34/21. *synful* 36/22. OE. *syngian*: *synnen* 77/20. *sinȝeþ* 5/7. *sinned* 40/4; 77/35. *synned* 50/5. OE. *wyrȝan*: *wirȝen* 5/6; 27/3; 35/13; 52/5; 57/2; 58/6. *wyrȝen* 6/8. *wirȝen* 13/8. *wirȝes* 67/31. *wyrȝeþ* 14/2. *wirȝand* 63/2. OE. *yfel*: *yuel* 7/1; 14/4; 17/24; 18/8; 30/2; 33/13; 14; 34/12; 36/28; 43/19; 54/16; 58/12; 71/12. *iuel* 7/4; 13; 9/28; 10/3; 16/16; 17/1; 19/2; 21/3,18; 25/4; 30/1,5; 31/9; 33/7,16; 36/16,23; 50/5; 54/20,22; 55/5; 59/5; 63/4; 68/26;

70/1,14,26; 77/23,63; 79/17. *iuels* 5/12; 20/11; 22/4; 24/3; 27/4; 34/5,14,29,30; 36/14; 37/13,21; 39/20, 40/1,5,8; 51/6; 53/5; 54/7; 57/6; 69/3; 78/9. *yueles*: 39/16.

### 5. OE. *ēo*.

*e* forms: OE.*bēon*: *ben* 1/5; 3/1; 4/3,8; 6/2,10; 9/3,15,18,21,23,26,27,28; 11/4,7; 12/3,5; 13/2,4,6; 15/2,3,11; 16/16; 17/10,20,25,28,33,40,49; 18/3,10,14,15; 19/9; 21/1; 4, 13,27,33; 24/6,11,16,18,20; 26/4; 30/13,18; 31/1; 4; 32/4,6,8,9,11,12,18; 33/15,18,19; 34/4,5,6; 18, 19,22,30; 35/3,9,11; 36/9,21,25,29,39,40; 37/2,4,5,7,17,20; 39/8,17, 20. OE.*bēop*: *bep* 23/7; 9; 30/31; 33/5. OE.*dēop*: *depe* 32/7. OE.*deorc*: *derk* 17/13; 34/7. *derknes* 17/11. *derknesse* 10/2; 17/31. *derknesses* 17/13. OE.*eorþe*: *erþe* 2/2; 7/5; 8/9; 9/40; 16/15; 17/9; 18/4; 21/28; 23/1; 32/14; 34/23; 36/3,31; 40/2. (*þ*)*erþe* 1/5; 2/8; 10; 8/1; 9/42; 20/10; 21/31; 24/14; 26/19; 32/5,8; 33/16; 36/36. OE.*fēoll*, *fēollon*: *fel* 7/16; 35/13. *fellen* 15/6; 26/4. OE.*fēond*: *fende* 17/37; 21/20; 22/2. *fendes* 21/16; 30/5; 34/20. OE.*feorr*: *fer* 21/1; 37/12; 39/15. OE.*frēond*: *friendes* 37/11. OE.*heofon*: *heuen* 2/4,6; 3/4; 8/8; 9/5,11,14; 10/1,4; 13/2,11; 19/7; 21/3; 30/27; 32/13; 35/5; 36/9,10,11. *heuene* 18/6. *heuenē* 23/9. *heuens* 8/2,4; 17/11; 18/1,9; 21/33; 27/7; 32/6. OE.*hēold*: *held* 31/3. *helde* 38/3. OE.*heorot*: *hertes* 17/36. OE.*heort*: *hert* 4/7; 5/10; 9/1,28,34,36; 10/2; 11/2; 12/2,6; 13/1; 14/3; 15/9; 16/4; 18/5; 19/4; 20/2; 21/14,22; 23/4; 24/18; 25/2; 26/5; 13; 20; 27/9; 30/31; 31/14; 32/11,21; 33/18; 34/21; 35/11; 36/4,15,33; 37/8,10; 38/4; 39/11,13,17; 40/6. *herte* 4/3. *heret* 7/11. *hertes* 4/5; 7/10; 9/41; 18/9; 21/27/ 27/4; 28/8; 32/15/ 34/28. OE.*lēosan*: *lesin* 5/6. *lese* 20/10. OE.*prēost*: *prest* 27/11. *preste* 2/2; 19/6. OE.*seofon*: *seuen* 11/7. OE.*sēon*: *sen* 5/4; 36/36. *sep* 36/13. OE.*steorra*: *sterres* 8/4. OE.*trēo*: *tre* 1/3. OE.*weorc*: *werkes* 8/4; 6; 16/5; 18/1; 27/6,7; 32/4,5.

### 6. OE. *ēa* - *i*.

*e* forms: W.S.*hieran*: *heren* 33/2. *here* 4/2,4; 5/3; 16/1,7; 19/7; 21/2; 26/12; 27/2; 33/15; 36/16; 38/16. *her* 19/1,10; 26/12; *herd* 3/4; 4/1; 6/8,9; 9/41; 16/7; 17/8,45; 18/3; 21/25; 27/8; 29/13; 30/16; 33/4,6,17; 37/14; 39/2. *herdest* 29/1; 30/29. *herand* 37/15. *harden* 136/5. W.S. (*ge*)*liefan*: *leuen* 21/32.

### OE. *æ*l + cons. + *i*.

*e* forms: O.E. *welle*: *welle* 35/9. *welles* 17/5,17; 73/16; 77/23; 103/11; 113/8. O.E. *elde*: *elde* 70/10,19; 92/10,14.

*i* form: W.S. *wielle*: *wille* 35/10.

*u* form: W.S. *ielde*: *vide* 70/10.

### 7. OE. *æ*l + cons.

(Unlengthened)

Fracture forms: OE. *cealf*: *chalf* 68/36; 105/10,20; *chelues* 49/10.

Non-fracture forms: OE. *fallan*: *fallen* 44/7; 61/3; 67/34; 70/9; 90/7; 117/12; 140/11; 144/15; PS. Anne 12. *falle* 81/7; 89/6; 139/11;



PS. Moysi 18. *falleþ* 132/2. *falland* 87/4; 142/8. *fallyng* 67/19; 143/14. OE. half: *half* 44/11; 54/27; 101/25; 118/107. OE. hall: *halles* 115/8; 121/2; 134/2.

(Lengthened)

Fracture forms: OE. eald: *elde* 76/5. OE. sealde: *seldest* 43/14. OE. tealde: *telde* 55/9. *telden* 43/1; 96/6; 118/85. *teld* 105/30. OE. (ge)weald: *welde* PS. Moysi 7; PS. Moyses 19.

Non-fracture forms: OE. ald: *old* 78/8; 88/48; 138/4; 142/5; 148/12; PS. Moysi 7. *olde* 6/7; 31/3; 36/26; 43/2; 48/15; 67/14; 106/31; 118/100; PS. Anne 5; PS. Moysi 39. OE. cald: *cold* PS. Ananie 6. *colde* 147/6; PS. Ananie 7. OE. haldan: *hold* 147/6. *holde* 34/25; 76/9; 129/3; 137/12; 138/9; PS. Anne 12. *holden* 43/24; 77/41. OE. salde: *solde* 104/16; PS. Moysi 45. OE. talde: *told* 77/3; 118/26, 119. *tolden* 21/17.

8. OE. ear + cons.

*er* forms: OE. eart: *ert* 2/7; 8/5; 41/12. *nert* 5/4. *ertou* 42/5.

*ar* forms: OE. earm: *arme* 17/37; 135/15. OE. eart: *art* 3/6; 15/1; 18/16; 21/8,9; 22/4; 24/1,5; 30/4,5,18; 31/9; 39/24; 42/2; 43/6; 50/5; 51/1; 54/14; 55/10; 58/5,18; 60/3; 64/6; etc. OE. earwe 'arrow': *arwen*: 119/4; 126/5; PS. Abakuk 17. OE. heard: *hard* 16/5; 56/6; 593. *ardest* PS. Moysi 19. *hardnes* 104/32. *hardnesse* 102. OE. hearp: *harp* 70/25; 97/6. *harpe* 56/11; 91/3; 146/7; 150/3. OE. scarp: *sharp* 44/7; 51/2; 56/6; PS. Moysi 61. *sharp* 119/4. *sharppe* 149/6. *sharpnes* 40/3; 62/9. *sharpnesses* 67/8; PS. Abakuk 23. OE. spearwe: *sparowe* 101/8; 123/6. *sparowes* 103/17.

9. OE. *žag*, *ēah*.

*e* form: OE. *hēah*: *he* 98/2.

*ei* form: OE. *hēah*: *heize* 46/2.

*ež* forms: OE. *ēage*: *eže* 16/9; 30/11; 53/7; 91/11; 93/9. *ežen* 5/5; 6/7; 9/31; 10/5; 12/4; 13/7; 16/3,12; 18/9; 24/6; 25/3; 30/28; 31/10; 33/15; 34/24; 35/1; 37/10; 65/6; 68/4,28; 76/4; 78/10; etc. *hezen* 32/1. *eželiddes* 10/5. *eženliddes* 131/4. OE. *hēah*: *heže* 7/8; 17/19,27,30,36; 67/19; 74/5; 76/10; 77/20,39,62; 88/27; 103/18; 112/4; 135/12; 136/7; etc. *eže* 101/20. *hežest* 7/18; 18/6; 7; 20/7; 70/21; 81/6; 82/17; 86/1,5; 90/1; 91/8; 96/10; 106/11. *hežnes* 94/4; 148/1. *heženes* p. 184/6. *eženes* 11/9. *hežestlich* 9/2; 91/1. OE. *nēah*: *neže* 26/3; 72/2; 118/15; 144/19.

10. OE. *a* + nasal.

(Unlengthened)

*a* forms: OE. fram: *fram* 1/5; 2/3; 3/4; 5/12; 7/1,4,13; 9/3,27,28,34,40; 11/1,4,8; 12/1; 13/2,11; 26/14; 29/3; 9; 30/1,5,9,15,19,25,26,28; 31/9; 32/13,14,19; 33/4,7,13,14; 34/20,25; 36/8,23,28,42; 37/8,9,12,22; 38/3,12/13; 39/2,14,19; 40/1,14; etc. OE. gan: *bigan* 38/4. OE. man: *man*: 1/1; 5/7; 8/5; 9/42; 17/28; 52; 24/13; 29/12; 31/2; 33/8,12; 34/17; 36/7,24,34,39; 37/15; 38/9,14,15;

39/6; 40/10. *mannes* 8/5; 28/2. OE.*manig*: *mani* 3/1; 4/6; 21/11; 31/8,13; 33/19; 35/6; 36/17. *many* 3/2; 17/19; 21/11; 28/3; 30/6; 39,5,7,12. OE.*nama*: *name* 4/4; 5/14; 7/18; 8/1,9; 9/2,5,10; 12/6; 17/53; 19/1,5,8; 21/22; 22/3; 24/12; 28/2; 30/4; 32/21; 33/3; 39/6; 40/5. *names* 15/4.

PSALTEF

### 11. 3<sup>rd</sup> Singular Present Indicative.

*ep* forms: *askep* 10/5; *bicomep* 32/1; *castep* 1/5; *deceiuep* 14/6; *dop* 7/15; 13/2; 14/7; 36/7; *doutep* 24/13; *dwelliep* 9/7; *entrep* 14/2; *euep* 17/51; *glorifiep* 14/5; *goep* 33/7; *gouvernep* 22/1; *hatep* 10/6; *haep* 4/4; 10; 9/33,34; 13/11; 16/17; 26/10; 16; 36/25,35; 37/10; 39/6; *hape* 39/17; *helpiep* 21/10; 36/18; 40/1; *heriep* 33/3; *hidep* 18/7; *hopep* 20/7; 33/8; *iugep* 7/8; *kepep* 33/20; *knowep* 34/9; *lackep* 38/7; *laip* 36/25; *lanep* 'lendeth' 36/27; *louep* 10/6,8; 32/5,20; 33/12; 36/29; *lynep* 17/50; *makep* 7/11; 28/6,9; *proudep* 9/23; *puttep* 18/2; *reprocep* 32/10; *saip* 11/5; *seip* 2/3; *sechep* 36/34; *seep* 36/13,34; *shewep* 18/2; *singep* 5/7; *sittep* 9/30; *slepep* 40/9; *spekep* 16/11; *swerep* 14/6; *techep* 17/37; *tellep* 18/1; *trespasep* 35/1; *turnep* 9/34; *understondep* 18/13; *waitep* 9/31,32; *wastep* 32/10; *wonep* 2/4; 9/11; 23/1; 32/11; *wyrchep* 14/2.

### 12. Plural of Present Indicative.

*ep* forms: *haue* 19/10. *loue* 4/2.

*ep* forms: *dop* 1/4; *doutep* 2/1; *sechep* 4/3.

*n* forms: *acorden* 2/2; *afien* 2/13; *arisen* 3/1; *asken* 10/5; *beren* 25/4; *bysetten* 3/6; *compassen* 31/9; *deuouren* 13/8; *douten* 21/23; 33/9; *fallen* 21/31; *for zeten* 9/18; *zelden* 7/4; *gladen* 34/29; *gon* 8/8; *han* 16/12; 17/6; 21/16; 26/16; 36/22; 39/15; 16; *hopen* 5/13; 30/24,31; 32/18; 33/22; *iugen* 2/10; *knowen* 9/10; *knowwen* 30/14; *liuen* 37/20; *loken* 9/31; 10/5; *louen* 5/14; 39/22; *pursuen* 7/1; 30/19; 34/3; *saien* 39/21; *sechen* 21/27; 34/4; 39/19,22; *seruen* 36/9; *siggen* 3/2; 4/6; *speken* 5/6; 27/4; 30/22; *tellen* 18/1; *trublen* 3/1; 12/5; 22/6; *penchen* 9/23; *vpstonden* 2/2; *wirchen* 5/6; 27/3; 35/13; *wirichen* 13/8; *wyrchen* 6/8; *wonen* 28/7; 32/8; 14.

### 13. Present Participle.

*nd* forms: *euerlastend* 138/23; Creed 10 (3). 11 (2), 39. *hatend* 138/20.

*nd* forms: *abidand* 39/1; *anoiand* 34/1,15; *a noiand* 9/30; *arisand* 17/52; 43/7; *beggand* 39/23; *blissand* 36/23; *brekand* 28/5; *brynnand* 7/14; *comand* 18/5; *constreinand* 34/6; *descendand* 27/1; *doand* 9/17; 33/16; 45/9; *doutand* 21/26; 30/23; *dredand* 24/15; 32/18; 60/5; *dyand* 48/9; *etand* 25/3; *euerlastand* 23/7,9; 57/9; *failand* 36/21; *falland* 29/3; *feztand* 55/1,2; *fitand* 34/1; *fleand* 54/7; *fructifiand* 51/8; *gaderand* 32/7; *zifand* 18/8; *hatand* 17/44; *hauand* 37/15; *hezand* 3/3; *herand* 37/15; *heriand* 17/4,54; *hopand* 16/8; 31/13; *ioiand* 41/5; *kestand* 16/12; *liztenand* 18/9; *liuiand* 26/19; 38/8; *liueand* 41/5; 51/5; 54/16; 57/9; *makand* 18/9; 22/7; 28/8; 57/5; 64/7; *offerand* 26/11; *openand* 37/14; *passand* 38/7; *praiand* 27/7; *precheand* 2/6; *pursuand* 34/7; 43/18; *rauissand* 21/12; 34/12; *reproceand* 43/18; *rumiand* 21/12; *saiand* 21/7; *sauaand* 51/2; *sechand* 13/3; 23/6; 33/10; 52/3; *sechaund* 7/10;

*settand* 32/7; *smytand* 28/7; *sittand* 49/21; *sorwand* 42/2; *spekand* 34/23; 43/18; 62/10; *sukand* 8/3; *trespassand* 24/9; *trowand* 17/33; *trubland* 26/18; 51/4; 59/13; *turnand* 9/3; 18/8; *penchand* 6/5; 8/5; 15/4; 19/3; 34/5; 41/8; *waimentand* 34/17; *willand* 5/4; *woniand* 47/12; 64/13; *wrytand* 44/2. PSALTER

#### 14. Feminine Pronoun.

NOM. *she* 83/3; PS. Anne 8. GEN. *hir* PS. Moysi 15; *her* 83/3.

#### 15. Plural Pronoun.

NOM. *hyy* 17/21.

*hii* 2/1; 9/21.

*hij* 2/13; 3/1; 5/11,12,13; 6/10(3); 9/10,15; 10/2,3; 11/2,4; 12/5; 13/4,5,7,8,9(2); 15/3; 16/11,13/16(2); 17/20,41,42,45,49; 18/3,15; 19/8(2),9; 20/11(2); 21/4(4),12,17,18,27(2),31; 24/20(2); 26/3,4,5; 27/7; 30/15,17(2),21; 31/1,8; 32/9(2); 33/2,13; 34/4(2),6,8(2),14,15; 18,19(3),21,22,23,24,28(2),29(2),39,42; 37/4,12(2),13(2),20,21; 39/19(3),20,21,22(2); 40/9,10.

GEN. *here* 2/3(2).

*her* 5/10,11,12; 9/5,6,7,16,41; 10/2,7; 11/2; 13/2,5,6,7; 15/3,4; 16/11,12,15,16; 18/4; 20/10,12; 21/6,12; 24/23; 26/18; 27/5,6,7; 31/12; 32/6; 12; 15; 33/15,20; 34/7,8,19,20,24,28; 36/14,16,41; 39/21; 40/11.

DAT. *hem* 2/1,4,5,9,11,12; 7/13; 9/21,37,42; 11/6; 15/2; 16/9,15; 17/16,20,41,42,45,46; 18/3,4,12; 20/9,12; 21/3,18,27; 22/6; 25/4; 26/18; 27/3,5,6,12; 28/6,7; 30/7,14,17,24,25,26,30; 31/9; 32/18,19; 33/9,16,17,18,19,20; 34/2,6,7,25; 35/9,11; 36/42; 38/10; 39/16.

#### 16. Plural of 'be'.

*ben* 1/5; 2/13; 3/1; 4/3,5,8; 6/2; 9/15,21,23,26; 11/4,7; 13/2,4,6; 15/2,3,11; 16/16; 17/10,25,33,40,49; 18/3,10; 19/9; 21/1,4,13; 24/6,11,16,18,20; 26/4; 30/13,18; 31/4; 32/4,6,8,9,11,12,18; etc.

#### 17. Past Participle.

##### a) Strong Verbs.

With *i* prefix: *yfunden* 36/38.

Without *i* prefix: *borne* 21/33; *bounden* 19/9; *chosen* 17/29; *don* 39/6; *drunken* 22/7; 35/9; *fallen* 36/25; *forzeten* 9/34; *founden* 9/39; 16/4; 35/2; *geuen* 30/15; *hulpen* 27/9; *knowen* 9/17; 15/11; 19/6; 31/5; 38/5; *taken* 9/16; 17/23; 17/6; 26/16; *wasshen* 38/18; *wryten* 39/11.

##### b) Weak Verbs.

With *i* prefix: *ytried* 11/7; *y shewed* 17/17.

Without *i* prefix: *blisced* 2/13; 17/50; 27/8; 30/27; 31/2; 32/12; 33/8; 39/6; 40/1,2,14; *blesced* 1/1; *blysced* 31/1; *brougt* 14/5; *cast* 30/28; *clensed* 18/14; *cloped* 34/15,30; *confermed* 37/20; *conforted* 17/20; *confounded* 39/19; *conuerted* 6/10; *corrupted* 13/2; *cried* 4/4; *crouned* 5/15; *dampned* 38/18; *dresced* 25/12; 36/24; *entred* 25/11; *fastened* 32/6; *fed* 36/3; *feld* 19/9; *ficched* 9/15; 37/2; *fild* 16/17;



21/27; *filed* 9/26; 18/8; *fourmed* 32/9; *gladed* 34/18; *greued* 31/4; **PSALTER**  
 37/4; *hezged* 8/2; 12/3; 17/50; 36/21; *herd* 18/3; *heried* 9/24;  
 33/2; 34/31; 39/23; *hered* 7/6; *hid* 16/16; 37/9; *hed* 31/1; *iuged*  
 9/20; *iugod* 36/35; *kept* 36/29; *ladd* 30/21; *lered* 2/10; *lifted*  
 23/7,9; *litted* 11/1; *lowed* 37/8; *made* 4/4; 9/9; 13/2; 17/21,  
 40,49; 18/10; 19/3; 21/4,14; 25/1; 26/4; 29/9,13; 30/13,14,16,21;  
 31/11; 32/9,22; 33/10; 34/6,7; 36/8; 37/6;18; *merked* 4/7;  
*multiplied* 3/1; 4/8; 37/20; 39/8,17; *newed* 38/3; *prikked* 4/5;  
 29/5; 34/19; *punist* 36/30; *purged* 11/7; *put* 36/33; *putt* 35/13;  
*saued* 32/16,17; *sett* 1/3; *shewed* 16/17; 21/33; 24/15; *sinned*  
 40/4; *sougt* 9/39; *stablist* 4/10; *stablyst* 2/6; *stired* 12/5; 14/7;  
 15/8; 16/6; 20/7; 29/7; 37/17; *styred* 2/13; 7/13; 9/28; 17/9;  
*trubled* 6/2,3,7,10; 17/5; 30/11,13; 33/18; 38/15; *tribled* 37/10;  
 38/9; *turmented* 37/8; *turned* 6/4; 7/17; 9/18; 13/11; 31/4; 34/5,16;  
 39/20; *wasted* 7/10; 34/19; *worshipped* 36/21; *wraped* 17/9.

### 18. Infinitive.

*n* forms: (127 examples): *anhezen* 36/36; *apperen* 16/17; *bisechen* 26/7;  
*bipe(n)chen* 21/28; *bliscen* 15/7; 28/10; 33/1; *breken* 2/9; 17/42;  
*climben* 23/3; *comen* 21/33; *crien* 21/2; 29/10; *cumpassen* 31/13;  
*defailen* 22/1; *defenden* 33/7; 39/12; *delyten* 36/11; *deuouren*  
 34/28; *dien* 36/40; 40/5; *douten* 22/4; 26/1; 39/5; *drescen* 7/10;  
 24/10; *drien* 36/2; *dwellen* 5/5; 24/14; 29/6; *entren* 5/8; *eten*  
 21/27; *fallen* 7/17; 9/33; 17/42; 21/31; 36/2; *fallwen* 1/4; *folwen*  
 22/8; 36/7; *forsaken* 36/29; *fulfillen* 15/11; *gaderen* 38/10; *zelden*  
 36/22; 40/11; *gladen* 5/14; 9/2,15; 13/11; 15/9; 20/1; 30/8;  
 34/10; 39/22; *gouerneren* 2/9; *helpen* 36/42; *herien* 9/42; 19/15; 18;  
 21/22,27; 34/21; *hiden* 30/24; *hopen* 17/2; 26/6; 35/8; 39/5;  
*ioien* 9/2; 30/8; 34/10; 39/22; 40/11; *ioyen* 5/3; 13/11; 19/5;  
 20/1; *joien* 12/5; *kepen* 11/8; 38/1; *known* 13/8; *lesin* 5/6; *leuen*  
 21/32; *ligten* 20/6; *liuen* 21/27; *lowen* 17/30; *multiplien* 1/4;  
*passen* 17/32; *perissen* 1/7; 9/3; 40; 36/20; *praysen* 11/4; *psalmen*  
 20/13; *pursuen* 36/12; *regnen* 9/40; *resten* 14/1; 15/9; *restoren*  
 15/5; *saien* 34/11; *sechen* 9/36; 30/30; *seruen* 21/32; *shryuen*  
 17/33; *siten* 28/7; *speken* 2/5; *stiren* 28/7; *stonden* 35/13; *stum-*  
*blen* 38/15; *syngen* 9/2; 20/13; *taken* 17/41; *tellen* 9/1; 29/12;  
 37/19; *tollen* 21/22; *trespassen* 33/21;22; *trublen* 2/5; 20/9;  
*penchen* 34/32; 36/32; *vnder nymen* 2/4; *wasshen* 25/6; *wonen*  
 5/5,13; 14/1.

*e* forms: (111 examples): *an heze* 17/52; *arise* 1/6; *aryse* 11/5; *blisse*  
 5/14; 25/12; *breke* 28/5; *brenne* 38/4; *clepe* 17/4; *come* 31/8;  
*crye* 27/1; *dampne* 36/35; *defende* 17/46,52; 30/6; 32/19; 36/42;  
*deuoure* 20/9; *deliuere* 40/1; *doute* 3/6; *drawe drede* 26/2,5;  
*enfourme* 31/10; *enhabite* 27/7; *enheryte* 24/14; *erne 'run'* 18/5;  
*falle* 7/4; *finde* 36/10; *folwe* 36/8; *for sake* 36/35; *zelde* 21/26;  
*zeue* 1/3; 2/8; 17/27; 24/9; 35/9; 36/4; *glade* 32/21; *haue* 5/7;  
*heze* 29/1; *helpe* 39/18; *here* 4/4; 5/3; 19/7; 21/2; 33/15; 37/16;  
*iuge* 9/8,42; *kepe* 17/26; *lade* 30/4, 5; *laste* 33/12; *lese* 20/10;  
*loke* 11/8; 34/20; *loue* 17/1; *make* 11/6; 20/12; 40/2; *norisse*  
 30/4; *perisse* 9/19; 36/30,36; *praie* 5/3,8; 29/10; 31/7; *pursue*  
 17/41; *rayne* 10/7; *saiie* 26/11; 28/8; *saue* 33/18; 35/7; *scorne*  
 36/13; *seche* 9/25; 26/13; 36/10; *shade 'shed'* 13/6; *shame* 24/1;

*shewe* 21/33; 28/8; *shryue* 6/5; 7/18; 9/1; 27/10; 29/2; 15; 31/6; 34/21; *sitte* 25/5; *slepe* 4/9; *speke* 36/32; *stonde* 5/4; 17/42; *synge* 7/18; 12/6; 17/53; 26/11; *singe* 12/6; *take* 23/5; *teche* 17/39; 24/10; 33/11; *turne* 17/41; 21/28; *penche* 1/2; 37/19; *vnderstonde* 35/3; *wasshe* 6/6; *wonne* 26/7.

PSALTER

No ending (28 examples): *borow* 36/22; *deliuer* 32/11, 12; *diliuer* 36/42; *encumpas* 7/7; *enherit* 36/31; *en herit* 36/23; *enerit* 36/11; *fail* 36/21; *figt* 17/37; *gader* 15/4; *gnaist* 'gnash' 36/ 36/12; *ȝyf* 13/11; 17/22; 20/6; 40/2; *mak* 7/2; 17/30; *peris* 40/5; *raunsoun* 7/2; *sett* 11/6; 12/2; 17/46; 20/6, 9, 12; *shew* 4/6; 7/13.

# PETERBOROUGH CHRONICLE (MS. Bodley Laud 636).

(Analysis of the dialect).

References to year of annals.

## 1. OE. *ǣ*.

*a* forms: OE. *acer*: *acer* 1124 (2); *acres* 1130; OE. *æt*: *at* 1123-27-28-29-54(4); OE. *bær*: *bar* 1137; OE. *fæder*: *fader* 1140; OE. *hwæt*: *wat* 1137; OE. *spæc*: *spac* 1140; OE. *stæl*: *stal* 1140; OE. *þæt*: *þat* 1135-37(4)-40(3)-54(3); OE. *wæs*: *was* 1123(2)-24-27-28(4)-32(3)-35-37(13)-40(11)-54(6);

CHRON.

*æ* forms: OE. *æfter*: *æfter* 1122(4)-23(6)-24(2)-25-26(2)-27-(2)-28-29-(4)-30(3)-31(4)-35-40; *æftor* 1127; (*þær*)*æfter* 1130; OE. *æt*: *æt* 1123-25-27-31-35-37-38-40(2)-54; OE. *bæd*: *bæd* 1127; OE. *cræft*: *cræftes* 1131; OE. *læsten*: *læste* 1122; OE. *sæt*: *besæt* 1140(2); *be sæt* 1135-40; OE. *stæl*: *stæl* 1140; OE. *þæs*: *þæs* 1122-24; OE. *þæt*: *þæt* 1122-23(2)-26-27-54; OE. *wæs*: *wæs* 1122(6)-23-(26)-24(8)-25(8)-26-27(22)-28(3)-29(6)-30(3)-31(6)-37(4)-40(5); OE. *wæter*: *wæter* 1122.

*ae* forms: OE. *wæs*: *waes* 1122.

*ea* forms: OE. *wæs*: *weas* 1122-28-29; OE. *spræc*: *spreac* 1131.

*e* forms: OE. *æfter*: *efter* 1132(3)-35-37-40(8); *herefter* 1135; OE. *bæd*: *bed* 1123(2); OE. *fæst*: (*soð*)*feste* 1124; OE. *þæs*: *þes* 1123(7)-24(11)-28-30-31; OE. *þæt*: *þet* 1122(3)-23(6)-24(4)-25-26-27(2)-29-31(2)-40; OE. *wæs*: *wes* 1122-24(2)-27-35(3)-37(3).

## 2. OE. *ǣ*<sup>1</sup>.

*æ* forms: OE. *ætton*: *æten* 1140; OE. *bræcon*: *bræcon* 1137; OE. *cwædon*: *cwæden* 1123(2); OE. *dæd*: *dædes* 1137; OE. *gæfon*: *iafen* 1125; OE. *gær*: *gær* 1124-25-35-37(2)-38-40-54; *gære* 1135-37; *gæres* 1125-27(2); OE. *lætan*: *forlæten* 1128; *for læten* 1129; OE. *mæd*: *mædwe* 1125; OE. *ræd*: *ræd* 1126-27-29-40; *ræde* 1131; OE. *sæd*: *sæd* 1124(2); OE. *slæp*: *slæp* 1131; OE. *spræce*: *spræce* 1123; OE. *spræcon*: *spræcon* 1123; OE. *wæpmon*: *wæpnen* 1123; OE. *wære*, -on: *wære* 1123(2)-29(2)-31(2); *wær* 1128; *wæren* 1140; *wæron* 1122(2)-23(4)-24(4)-25(3)-27(6)-29(3)-30-31(3)-32-35-37(6)-40(2)-54; *wæran* 1125.

*e* forms: OE. *ætton*: *eten* 1140; OE. *drædan*: *ofdred* (P.P.) 1135; OE. *lætan*: *leten* 1140; OE. *ræd*: *red* 1129-40; OE. *sæd*: *sed* 1124; OE. *slæp*: *slep* 1135; OE. *slæpan*: *slepen* 1137; OE. *wæron*: *uueron* 1137.

*ea* forms: *gear* 1124-25-26-27-29-31(2)-32; *geare* 1122-22-28; *geares* 1122-23(3)-24(2)-25(2)-26-28(3)-29(3)-30(2)-31(2); OE.gæfon: *geauen* 1128; OE.wæron: *wearen* 1122.

*a* forms: OE.bæron: *forbaren* 1137(2); OE.næddre: *nadres* 1137; OE.wære: *ware* 1140; *uuare* 1135; *waren* 1137; *uuaren* 1137.

### 3. OE. æ<sup>3</sup>.

*æ* forms: OE.æfre: *æfre* 1123(2), 40; *æure* 1137(3); OE.ænig: *æni* 1124; OE.ær: *ær* 1123(3)-24-25-27-28-29(3)-31(2)-37-40-54; *æror* 1123-24-25-26-27(3)-29; *ærost* 1124; OE.dælan: *dæleth* 1130; *to dælde* 1140; OE.hwæte: *hwæte* 1124; OE.lædan: *læden* 1126; *læd* 1140; OE.læfan: *læuede* 1127; OE.læran: *læred* 1125 27(2); OE.næfre: *næfre* 1123(2)24-23-29-31(3); *nære* 1137(3); OE.sæ: *sæ* 1122-25-27-30-31-35-37-40-54; OE.tæcen: *betæcen* 1131; *be tæcen* 1131.

*ea* forms: OE.ær: *ear* 1123; OE.twæman: *to tweamde* 1127.

*e* forms: OE.dælan: *to deld* 1137; *to deled* 1140; OE.flæsc: *flec* 1137; *flesc* 1131; OE.hæs: *hese* 1123; OE.hæden: *hedene* 1128; *hethen* 1137; OE.lædan: *ledde* 1125; *ledden* 1140; OE.læran: *lered* 1137; OE.næfre: *neure* 1137; 1140(3); *nefra* 1129.

### 4. OE. ȝ.

*e* forms: OE.wyrse: *werse* 1137(3); *wærese* 1140(3); OE.byrig: *Cantwaraberi* 1140; *Hyrtlingberi* 1137; *Seresberi* 1131 37.

*i* forms: OE.brycg: *Brigge* 1126; *briggs* 1125; OE.byrig: *Cantwarabyri* 1129-30; *Cantwarabyrig* 1122-23(4)-25(2)-29(2); *Cant wara byrig* 1123; *Glastingbiry* 1129; *Særes byri* 1126-30; *Særes byrig* 1123; *Seres byrig* 1123(2); *Seares byrig* 1123(2); OE.byrgan: *byrieden* 1137-54; *bebyried* 1137-54(2); *bebyriged* 1128; *by byriged* 1129; *be byrigde* 1123(2); OE.byrden: *byrthen* 1135; OE.cyne: *kinerice* 1124; OE.cynn: *cinnes* 1129; OE.dyne: *eord dine* 1129; *eord dyne* 1122; OE.fyllan: *fylden* 1137(2); OE.fȝr: *fir* 1122(5) 31; OE.fyrst: *first* 1125; *firste* 1128; *alrefyrst* 1135; OE.hyrne: *hyrne* 1131; OE.lȝtel: *litel* 1124-25-28-29-35-40(2); *litle* 1124; OE.gemȝnd: *gemynd* 1131; OE.mȝnegan: *mint* 1137; OE.mȝnstre: *minster* 1154; *minstre* 1122-27(2)-28(3)-32-37-40; *mȝnstre* 1123(3)-28-30-(4)-31(6)-32-37; OE.stȝrian: *stȝred* 1140; OE.sȝnn: *sinnes* 1137; OE.yfel: *ifel* 1124; *ifele* 1124; *iuele* 1130; *yfel* 1135; *yuel* 1140(3); *yuele* 1137(2).

### 5. OE. ƿo.

*æo* forms: OE.eorl: *æorl* 1140.

*ea* forms: OE.hēold: *heald* 1127; *healden* 1124.

*æ* forms: OE.dēor: *dær* 1135; *dære* 1137; OE.(ge)ēode: *iæde* 1140; *gæde* 1137.

*eo* forms: OE.bēon: *beon* 1127 28 30; OE.dēofol: *deoules* 1137; OE.eorl: *eorl* 1122-24(5)-26(3)-27(4)-28(2)-29(2)-31-38-40(14)-54; *eorles* 1123(3)-24(4)-27(8)-40(3); *eorldom* 1127(2); *eorldome* 1124; OE.eorðe: *eorðe* 1122; *eorð* 1122 29; OE.feola: *feole* 1122(2)-27; *feola* 1125(2); OE.fēond: *feond* 1129; OE.feorða: *feorðe* 1130; OE.frēond:



*freond* 1120-29-40(2); OE.*heofon*: *heouene* 1122-31; OE.*hēold*: *heold* 1124-25-29-30(3)-40-54; *heolden* 1124-37(2); *heoldon* 1129-40; OE.*lēode*: *leod* 1129; OE.*prēost*: *preostes* 1129-37; OE.*seofon*: *seouenih* 1123-27; OE.*sēoð*: *seoð* 1124; OE.*weorc*: *weorces* 1137; *weorkes* 1137.

*e* forms: OE.*bēon*: *ben* 1127-32-37(2)-40(3); *beð* 1131; OE.*beneoðan*: *benedan* 1125(2); OE.*cēosan*: *cesen* 1123(2); OE.*dēop*: *dep* 1137; OE.*dēor*: *der(fald)* 1127; *der fald* 1123; OE.(ge)*ēodon*: *iedon* 1123; *ieden* 1137; OE.*eorðe*: *erthe* 1137; OE.*feola*: *fela* 1123; 1124(4)-27; OE.*frēond*: *friend* 1135; OE.*hēold*: *held* 1123-24(4)-29-31-35; *helden* 1123-29-35-40; *helde* 1140; *beheld* 1123; *behelde* 1128.

#### 6. OE. *ǣa* + *i*.

*e* forms: WS.*flīeman*: *flemd* 1129; *flemden* 1131 38; *aflemde* 1124; *aflemdon* 1124; WS.*gīeman*: *be gemen* 1129; WS.*hīeran*: *herde* 1140; *herd* 1127; *herden* 1127; *herdon* 1127; WS.*ierfe*: *erue* 1125; WS.*gehīer-sum*: *hersumnesse* 1131; WS.*stīepel*: *stepel* 1122.

*eo* form: WS.*hīeran*: *geheord* 1122.

#### 7. OE. *æl* + cons.

##### (Unlengthened)

*eal* forms: OE.*cwealm*: *cwealm* 1125; OE.*eall*: *eall* 1122-23(10)-24(3)-25(7)-26(4)-27(8)-28(2)-29(4)-30-31(7); *eal* 1122-23-27; *ealle* 1122(2)-23(7)24(5)-25(7)-27(6)-28(3)-29(10)-30-31(5); *ealla* 1124(2); *ealles* 1124; *ealswa* 1123; OE.*healf*: *healfe* 1122.

*æl* form: OE.*eall*: *ælle* 1137.

*al* forms: OE.*cwealm*: (*orf*)*cwalm*: 1131; OE.*eall*: *al* 1137(4)-40(4); *all* 1137; *alle* 1137(6)-40(6)-54; *alre* 1124; *alswa* 1129; *alsua* 1154; *alsuic* 1137; OE.*healf*: *half* 1123(2)-29-31-37.

##### (Lengthened)

*eal* forms: OE.*eald*: *eald* 1127; OE.*wealdan*: *wealden* 1123; *wealde* 1123.

*æl* form: *sælde* 1124.

*al* forms: OE.*eald*: *ald* 1135; OE.*healdan*: *halden* 1140(3).

#### 8. OE. *ear* + cons.

*ear* forms: OE.*bearn*: *forbearn* 1122; *for bearn* 1123; OE.*earn*: *earmes* 1123; OE.*earn* 'poor': *earmlice* 1127; 1128; OE.*hearm*: *hearm* 1123; OE.*weard*: (*ufen*)*weard* 1122; OE.*wearð*: *wearð* 1122-23-25(2)-28(4).

*ær* forms: OE.*eard*: *ærde* 1130; OE.*earn*: *ærme* 1124; OE.*scearp*: *scærp* 1137; *scærpe* 1137; OE.*stearf*: *stærf* 1124; OE.*wearð*: *wærð* 1127-29; *wærd* 1140(2)-54.

*ar* forms: OE.*heard*: *harde* 1126; OE.*nearwe*: *nareu* 1137; OE.*sweart*: *swart* 1122; *swarte* 1127(4); OE.*wearð*: *warð* 1127; *warth* 1135; *uuard* 1135.

9. OE. *ēag*, *ēah*.

*æ* forms: OE. *ēage* *ægon* 1124; OE. *þēah*: *þæh*. 1123.

*ea* forms: OE. *nēah*: *neah* 1127; OE. *þēah*: *þeah* 1125-28.

*e* forms: OE. *ēage*: *bradegede* 1127; OE. *hēah*: *heh* 1125; *hehllice* 1154; *hegllice* 1137.

10. OE. *a* + nasal.

(Lengthened)

OE. *band*: *bande* 1126. OE. *hand*: *hand* 1125(2)-27; *hande* 1127(5); OE. *land*: *land* 1125-27(4)-28-29(2)-32-37(8)-38(2); *lande* 1123-25(2)-26(3)-32-37-40; *landes* 1135(2)-37(4)-40; Engle *land* 1123(2)-24-27(3)-31(2)-40(2); Engleland 1129-31-40(2); Englelande 1130; Engle *lande* 1124(2)-25; Engleland 1129(4); Engla *land* 1122-27; Engla-*lande* 1129; Engla *lande* 1123-25(3)-28(2); Sex*lande* 1129; OE. *lang*: *lang* 1132; *lange* 1122-27-40. OE. *gemang*: *amang* 1127; *en mang* 1135; OE. *strang*: *strang* 1123; *strange* 1124; *strangelice* 1123.

(Unlengthened)

OE. *can*: *can* 1137; OE. *fram*: *fram* 1122-23(3)-24-26-27(4)-28(2)-29(3)-30-31-37; OE. *gan*: *gan* 1129; OE. *limpan*: *gelamp* 1124; *belamp* 1137; OE. *man*: *man* 1123(5)-24-(7)-25(3)-27(4)-30-31(2)-35(3)-37(6)-40-54(2); *manne* 1124-27-31; *mannes* 1137; OE. *manig*: *mani* 1137(3); *manie* 1137; OE. *þanc*: *un þancas* 1123; OE. *wan* (vb.): *wan* 1123-24-37-40; *uan* 1137.

11. 3<sup>rd</sup> Singular Present.

-*ep* forms: *behofed* 1131; *be ræfod* 1124; *cumeþ* 1123; *dæleth* 1130; *doð* 1127; *seið* 1130; *seoð* 1124; *seþ* 1124; *singað* 1127; *sitted* 1130; *slæð* 1124

## 12. Plural Present Indicative.

-*að* form: *dragað* 1127.

-*en* forms: *lien* 1137; *seggen* 1127.

## 13. Present Participle.

-*ende*: *bærnende* 1131; *gangende* 1131; *ridend* 1137; *sittende* 1137; *spre-  
cende* 1123.

## 14. Feminine Pronoun.

NOM. *scæ* 1140(6).

GEN. *hire* 1126-27-40.

DAT. *hire* 1127(3)-47(8).

## 15. Plural Pronoun.

NOM. *hi* 1122(2)-23(12)-25(3)-27(3)-28-29(6)-31(4)-35-37(22)-40(7)-54.

GEN. *heore* 1140.

*heora* 1125(2).

*her* 1124-35-37-40.

*here* 1123(4)-24(2)-25(2)-27(2)-31-35-37(3)-40(2).

DAT. *hem* 1123(6)-24(4)-29(2)-31(5).  
*heom* 1123-27(2)-35-37(10)-38-40(10)-54.

16. Plural of 'be'.

*beon* 1127.

17. Past Participle.

Strong Verbs.

With prefix: *gedon* 1123; *ge don* 1125; *gehaten* 1123-27-54; *ge haten* 1123(4)-24-25-27-30-32; *geseogen* 1122.

Without prefix: *boren* 1123-29; *coren* 1129; *cosen* 1123; *cumen* 1135; *don* 1123-26; *gifen* 1127; *giuen* 1126; *læten* 1127; *numen* 1124-27; *segon* 1127; *saegon* 1127; *suoren* 1137.

Weak Verbs.

With prefix: *ge bletsod* 1123; *ge gaderod* 1123; *ge halgod* 1129; *ge spilde* 1124; *gewunded* 1128; *ge wunded* 1128.

18. Infinitive.

-en forms: *a cwencen* 1122; *axen* 1140; *be gemen* 1129; *begeton* 1131; *beieton* 1130; *beniman* 1125; *beran* 1123; *berene* 1127; *beswicen* 1131; *be suiken* 1140; *betæcen* 1131(2); *be wedden* 1127; *blawen* 1127; *cesen* 1123(2); *cumen* 1123(2)-25-28-29-31(2)-35-40(2); *cysten* 'spend' 1125; *don* 1126-31-37; *faren* 1132-37-54; *farene* 1129; *finden* 1137; *forlæten* 1128; *for læten* 1129; *gyuen* 1132-37; *iïuen* 1140(2); *halden* 1140(3); *hauen* 1127-40; *hauene* 1127(2); *hafen* 1123; 1127; *habben* 1127; *hunten* 1127; *læden* 1126; *leten* 1140; *lien* 1137; *liuen* 1137; *locen* 1129; *nimen* 1126; *rixen* 1140; *sægen* 1137; *sæin* 1137; *seggon* 1127; *secen* 1131; *setten* 1123 31; *sitten* 1137; *slepen* 1137; *swerene* 1127; *tacen* 1127; *tellen* 1137; *tybian* 1123; *ðolen* 1127; *þolen* 1140; *understanden* 1123; *under standene* 1127; *underþeden* 1132; *uuerrien* 1135; *winnan* 1138; *wunien* 1128.

Summary.

The preceding inquiry has shown that the dialect of the Psalter has none of the distinctive features of W. Midl. On the other hand, the dialect of the Psalter agrees fairly closely with that of the Northamptonshire *Peterborough Chron.*, and also, in certain phonological features, with the Northants. Place-Names. It is therefore suggested that the dialect of the Psalter is not W. Midl., but that of Northamptonshire, and of the south rather than the north of the county.

Oxford, 1924.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.



## Prof. Moulton and Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice.<sup>1)</sup>

It is impossible to approach literature as a science without incurring the risk of reducing it to a corpse or mechanism. (*Times Lit. Suppl.* 7—2—'24.)

Our first duty to literature is to love it. (Moulton. Preface to *The Modern Study of Literature*.)

It is not my intention in this essay to enter into a general discussion of Moulton's methods of literary criticism and analysis. This would not only require more space than a periodical has at its disposal, it would also be far above the powers of the present writer. Hence after some necessary words of introduction I shall restrict myself to those chapters in Moulton's *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist* which deal with *The Merchant of Venice*. Again as I only intend to state as clearly as possible how Moulton's methods strike me personally, I shall not attempt to compare his views with those of other critics. It will be convenient then to begin by stating as succinctly as possible what to me literary criticism at its best should be.

Of primary importance is the way in which a critic sets about the study of a work of art that is new to him. To me it seems that his attitude towards it should resemble that of a lover of nature, who, after having left his immediate surroundings, at once becomes conscious of subtle influences at work outside and inside him. He is glad to give himself up to these influences, he throws himself into nature heart and soul and body, until he is immersed in it. These, it is true, are not the ways of a scientific man, but then it is, I believe, a fact that after a life devoted to science it is possible for a man to have missed all that is essential and never to have got to the heart of nature at all. Nor is this state of things to be deplored, for nature, like music, is a thing for all men's wonder. Now to me all this seems equally true of the explorer in the field of literature. Just as the lover of nature should be "like a pipe for every wind to blow upon", the great critic should above all be impressionable. Something must thrill within him in response to whatever is beautiful and true, he must love it — and he must be conscious of a feeling of repugnance at whatever is ugly and false, he must hate it. Instinctively he should feel that praise is as irrelevant as blame, and not a little foolish: who praises the sun for being beautiful or the flowers for being lovely? But as the poet gives utterance to his joy when he sees the flower or the sun and makes us share it, the critic may, nay must, give utterance to his joy at finding something supremely beautiful in the domain of art and must help us to share it. It follows that a great critic should have a command of language not very inferior to that of the artist himself. It also follows, for no amount of analysis or study can guide us towards the truth in matters of this kind, that the critic should believe in general impressions and as he is more trustworthy in this respect he is a greater critic. To prevent misunderstanding, I hasten to add that I cannot imagine any one to be a great critic who is not endowed with an acute intellect, which prevents him from losing himself in hazy speculations hardly related to the subject he discusses. Nor should he be without the persevering patience which does not shrink from weary hours of diligent research.

I have so far tried to show what in my opinion should be the mental

<sup>1)</sup> With some unimportant changes this essay was read before a meeting of the „Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen”.

attitude of a critic towards a work of literary art. I may now proceed to *the task of the critic*. A superficial knowledge of the history of criticism is enough to see what is the great difference between the literary criticism of our days and that of the first centuries after the Renaissance. Up to the nineteenth century literary critics applied to artistic prose or poetry certain tests and praised or blamed the poet as he came up to these tests or failed to do so. Many critics thought it incumbent on them to tell the world what poet was "the best" and what poet the next best.<sup>1)</sup>

It is now generally recognised that the critic's most important work is to act as an interpreter, a humble task and a proud one at the same time; for on the one hand it implies that his attitude towards the literary artist is that of an inferior to his superior; but on the other the man that is bold enough to interpret a great artist, say Shakespeare, to us, assumes that he is nearer to Shakespeare than most other mortals, assumes that he surpasses the run of mankind in depth of humanity and in artistic sensitiveness.

Let us try to realize what this function of interpreting a great writer really means. It means in the first place that the critic should be able to penetrate deeply into the heart and soul not of an ordinary fellow-mortal, but of the most profound thinkers and dreamers that the world has produced, thinkers and dreamers who were generally hardly conscious themselves of what they were aiming at, as the princess in Torquato Tasso says of the poet who seems "etwas zu suchen, das wir nicht kennen Und er vielleicht am Ende selbst nicht kennt." Let us also remember that in the case of writers of by-gone ages the writer has never come into personal contact with the poet, has never heard his voice, never met the look of his eyes — and there is some truth in what George MacDonald says in *The Princess and Curdie*: "You need but take a person's hand, and you will know what good or evil beast is the truth of him." Besides, the critic can only be guided by what the poet has left behind him in writing, which is necessarily only a small part of all that he felt and thought. And then, even a poet cannot express with absolute clearness all that passes through his brains. "We all indulge," says a writer in one of the January numbers of the *Literary Times*, "in the strange, pleasant process called thinking, but when it comes to saying, even to some one opposite, what we think, then how little are we able to convey!"

Further a great critic will feel instinctively that he can only really understand a little of that side of the poet's nature that is related to his own.

Nur wer euch ähnlich ist, versteht und fühlt,  
Nur der allein soll richten und belohnen!

says Goethe's Tasso. Browning in the concluding lines of his *Men and Women* gives to each man two soul-sides, but Shakespeare's soul has as many sides as he finds readers. Besides Shakespeare, like ordinary mortals, was different from day to day and from year to year. Certain critics will have us believe that Shakespeare's personal emotions and thoughts are hardly reflected in his works. "The assumption", says Sir Sidney Lee in *The Year's Work in English Studies* 1922, "that Shakespeare reflects in his plays his personal experience and emotion at the time of writing is a critical fancy of the nineteenth century which takes an unconscionable time in dying." The reviewer in the *Literary Times* voices my opinion on the subject so perfectly that I can do no better than quote his words: "that he (i. e. Shakespeare)

---

<sup>1)</sup> See for instance: William Webbe. *A Discourse of English Poetry*. (Arber's Reprints, *passim*).

or any other poet ever produced a creative line which was not grounded in and suffused by 'personal experience and emotion at the time of writing' is, as any artist could assure Sir Sidney Lee, a psychological impossibility."

But if Shakespeare changed from hour to hour, the critic is no less subject to this and consequently Shakespeare is something different to him at different times of his life. To the young man from twenty to forty, let us say, Shakespeare is almost exclusively the writer of tragedies; as we grow older the comedies appeal to us more and more. Such at least has been my personal experience. The critic then should be constantly conscious of the fact that what seems to him certainly true at one moment, may strike him quite differently even the next day. Hence all criticism that aims at interpreting what is most worth being interpreted is of necessity subjective and mistakes, very serious mistakes, are unavoidable.<sup>1)</sup> Moulton holds up to ridicule a good many critics, mostly long dead and forgotten, who have blundered about Shakespeare. But the history of thought is the history of gigantic blunders. Does Moulton really think that any method of criticism can be found which would make mistakes of judgment impossible? If he means to suggest that the blunders were exceptionally stupid because they were made about Shakespeare, I do not see the point. The greater the writer, the more natural the mistakes are. Every one can enjoy Israel's paintings, but what about Vincent van Gogh? And yet the odds are that the latter's name will be mentioned with awe when Israel's will be known to specialists only. Besides, it is not true that no one understood Shakespeare's greatness before our own enlightened days. Those among the critics whose genius entitled them to an opinion on Shakespeare did not go entirely wrong. I will not quote Dryden's well-known lines from his prologue to *Aureng Zebe*, but it is hard to resist the temptation of giving once more the passage from the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, written while Dryden still advocated the introduction of rhyme into English drama.

"(Shakespeare) was the man who of all modern, and perhaps ancient poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul. All the images of Nature were still present to him, and he drew them, not laboriously, but luckily; when he describes anything, you more than see it, you feel it too. Those who accuse him to have wanted learning, give him the greater commendation: he was naturally learned; he needed not the spectacles of books to read Nature; he looked inward, and found her there. I cannot say he is everywhere alike; were he so, I should do him injury to compare him with the greatest of mankind. He is many times flat, insipid; his comic wit degenerating into clenches, his serious swelling into bombast. But he is always great, when some great occasion is presented to him; no man can say he ever had a fit subject for his wit, and did not raise himself as high above the rest of poets, *Quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi*.

The consideration of this made Mr. Hales of Eaton say, that there was no subject of which any poet ever wrote, but he would produce it much better treated of in Shakespeare; and however others are now generally preferred before him, yet the age wherein he lived, which had contemporaries with him Fletcher and Johnson, never equalled them to him in their esteem; and in the last King's court, when Ben's

<sup>1)</sup> Perhaps it would be 'a consummation devoutly to be wished', if all critics could agree with a remark made by the late James Huneker in his introduction to Shaw's *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*: — All criticism is personal, and neither academic or impressionist criticism should be taken too seriously.



reputation was at highest, 'Sir John Suckling, and with him the greater part of the courtiers set our Shakespeare far above him.'" <sup>1)</sup>

The earnestness, the genuine emotion, the thoughtful compactness, and the wonderfully penetrative insight into Shakespeare's genius cannot escape any one who will take the trouble to read this quotation with the attention it deserves. And who is not moved by Ben Jonson's tribute to Shakespeare's genius and character in the *Discoveries*: "I lov'd the man <sup>2)</sup>, and doe honour his memory (on this side Idolatry) as much as any. He was (indeed) honest, and of an open, and free nature: had an excellent *Phantsie*; brave notions, and gentle expressions." <sup>3)</sup>

There is another quality which the critic should have to the highest degree and to which I have not yet referred, although probably many would have begun with it: I mean that of *artistic sensibility*. No doubt the power of penetrating deeply into the emotional life of the poet is closely related to artistic sensitiveness, but the one does not necessarily imply the other. Lytton Strachey need not necessarily be a competent literary critic. And in this domain, above all, subjectivity is unavoidable. Hence aesthetic criticism is only important, if the critic is himself an artist or almost an artist. If there is nothing of the artist in him, he will continually go wrong. To people who are afraid of everything that is or sounds vague, I may remark that there is far less difference among great critics than is generally supposed. The cause may be found in Carl Scharten's words: "De schoonheid, . . . is niet een zwevend iets. De schoonheid is een zéér bepaald iets, onder duizend vormen. Allen, die het fijne verstand van litteratuur hebben, halen uit een zeker gedicht denzelfden schoonsten regel, en uit dien regel het woord of de klanken-combinatie, die er de schoonheid veroorzaken." <sup>4)</sup>

It need hardly be said that there is a large field of activity for the literary critic who does not feel drawn in the first place towards the artistic, psychological or philosophical aspects of literature. Biography, bibliography, textual criticism, literary history deserve all the devoted attention that is given to them in our days, but as far as literature is concerned they are important only in so far as they help us to come into closer contact with the soul of the poet; where they become ends in themselves and usurp the whole field, these studies can only lead us away from the living truth.

To me then the great critic should rather help us to feel than to understand the truth and the beauty of what the great writers have left us. He can only do this by summoning to his aid the deepest powers of his own soul, the utmost of him — his ratiocinative intellect alone will not carry him very far. If a critic has made me feel what I passed over before, or feel more deeply what I only half understood, he has done for me nearly all I want; in his method I am not deeply interested and one remark like Mr. Hopman's about Thomson's power of summoning before our eyes grand atmospheric phenomena is to me of more value than a minute scientific analysis of Thomson's poetic devices.

No doubt what I have said so far seems vague and unsatisfactory to many. People whose brains are different from mine want more clearly outlined methods, more definite results. Let them not be vexed at what must seem to them unscientific balderdash, let them remember that to others their

<sup>1)</sup> *Essays of John Dryden*. Vol. I. ed. Ker. pp. 79—80.

<sup>2)</sup> Dryden uses the same words in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*: — "Shakespeare was the Homer, or father of dramatic poets; Johnson was the Virgil, the pattern of elaborate writing; I admire him, but I love Shakespeare." *Essays* I. 82 f.

<sup>3)</sup> Ben Jonson, *Discoveries*. Bodley Head Quartos V p. 28.

<sup>4)</sup> *Handelingen XXXIle Nederl. Taal- en Letterkundig Congres te Antwerpen, 1912.*

neatly constructed systems often seem to miss what is essential. No doubt there is much truth in Prof. Jan te Winkel's remark made at the *Nederl. Taal- en Letterkundig Congres* at Antwerp in 1912, that there are many things in literature that can be discussed objectively, but that to discuss the subjective element in art one has to be an artist. But if Prof. te Winkel means us to draw the conclusion from this that only that which can be treated objectively should be admitted to our universities or to our schools, I protest most emphatically, for this would mean that we allowed ourselves to be caught in a net of our own making. The nineteenth century has discovered a new and exacting goddess, called Science, who claims as her own the earth and the fulness thereof. If in her name we are told that we must banish from the study of literature all that makes literature a costly possession, we shall do well to ask ourselves the question if we had not better give up worshipping the goddess altogether.

Professor Moulton, however, is<sup>1)</sup> one of her most devout believers. In his books one comes across the formidable words 'science' and 'scientific' on almost every page. And the strange thing is that even those who least believe in the efficacy of his methods can to a great extent agree with his general principles. In the Introduction to his *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist* he says that literary criticism should follow other branches of thought in becoming inductive. "To begin with the observation of facts; to advance from this through the arrangement of observed facts; to use *à priori* ideas, instinctive notions of the fitness of things, insight into far probabilities, only as side-lights for suggesting convenient arrangements, the value of which is tested only by the actual convenience in arranging they afford; to be content with the sure results so obtained as 'theory' in the interval of waiting for still surer results based on a yet wider accumulation of facts; this is a regimen for healthy science so widely established in different tracts of thought as almost to rise to that universal acceptance which we call common sense." In the same Introduction Moulton then proceeds on the assumption that there are two kinds of criticism. Here, I believe, is a source of grave misunderstanding. Moulton indiscriminately speaks of *a priori* criticism, judicial criticism, subjective criticism. In his *Modern Study of Literature* he even says: "Subjective criticism is the literature of appreciation". Now it is obvious that all these terms are not interchangeable. Hence the bewilderment that takes hold of the reader of Moulton's essay who at one moment finds himself heartily agreeing with his ideas and the next hopelessly at variance with them. There are presumably few people that would advocate a return to the old *à priori* methods or to the criticism of praise and blame; the critic as a dictator in the world of letters is an "exploded superstition" and Moulton is not fair to the advocates of more or less subjective criticism when he identifies them with the older school. No doubt throwing all critics past and present who are not purely inductive in their methods on a heap, made it easier for Moulton to hold them up to ridicule. But criticism should not be judged by its worst output and Prof. Moulton ought in fairness to have taken those writers whose critical judgment has stood the test of time. Instead of doing this, he calls up the ghost of Rymer, exalts Pope to the rank of 'one of the best critics England ever had' and even seems to look upon Byron as a serious literary critic. And when some of the greatest are referred to, it is with relish that Moulton recalls their

<sup>1)</sup> While this article was printing, the news came of Prof. Moulton's death. Although this could hardly affect my opinion about his work, the respect one naturally feels for unselfish devotion to any cause, might have induced me to change the form of one or two statements in the rest of my article, if this had still been possible.

glaring mistakes. True, he does not forget to mention that the reading of Shakespeare made Johnson doubt, if the theory of the unities of time and place was tenable, but he fails to add that it was not by inductive methods that Johnson came to this conclusion. Johnson, like Dryden and great Ben before him could not for all their heavy learning help feeling something stir in the depth of them when they read Shakespeare's plays or saw them performed. It was by listening to the voice of the sub-conscious that they found or almost found the way to what seems to us the truth about Shakespeare. The grave mistakes were made by those critics whose personality lacked the depth which alone can lead us to the truth. In order to show up the folly of the older school of criticism, Moulton once more quotes the ridiculous list of poets laureate before Southey. But does Prof. Moulton think that these poetasters owed the honour to their literary merits? The story of the very first poet laureate tells another tale. But if Prof. Moulton knows this, then what does his list prove? Would it not have been better to state simply that literary criticism, subjective or objective, has outlived the habit of distributing praise and blame, and of laying down arbitrary laws for their betters?

Moulton's great merit is his insisting on the necessity of inductive methods. The reckless bias with which he does this no doubt has secured him a hearing which he might not otherwise have got. "The first and last word in literary theory is interpretation. The criticism of inductive interpretation is the basis on which all other criticism rests."<sup>1)</sup> With this general statement nearly every one, I think, can agree. But when in the Introduction to Moulton's book on Shakespeare we read that 'inductive criticism is mainly occupied in distinguishing literary species', we realize how wide is the gulf between Moulton and those he has banished from the realms of science.

Now what is the fundamental difference between Moulton and what for convenience' sake I may call the subjective school of criticism? I believe we can find the answer by reading carefully the words I quoted above (page 204). Moulton insists on the accumulation of *facts*. Evidently he has asked himself, if in the domain of literature there are facts in the strictly scientific sense of the word, for on p. 39 of the Introduction to his Shakespeare-book he says: "Induction . . . . . may be presumed to apply wherever there is a subject-matter reducible to the form of fact." Evidently the whole question turns on this. Moulton's book starts from the assumption that there are such facts; my introduction has, I hope, made it clear that to me facts, strictly so called, can be found in the field of literature concerning what is least essential; as to the rest the critic, though he should never forget that a careful and even minute study of the work under discussion is indispensable, is ultimately thrown on the resources of his own emotional and intellectual susceptibility. And that this applies not only to details but to fundamentals will be apparent, if we remember the absolutely different conception the greatest actors have had of the same parts.

In the same passage Moulton refers to the 'sure results' obtained by his methods. Again I do not believe that the purely inductive method will exclude blunders. When Goethe inadvertently started the slander about Ophelia's "reifer, süszer Sinnlichkeit"<sup>2)</sup> and when Tieck followed suit, until at last Storrfrich could write that "nichts Jungfräuliches war an ihr, als — ihr unverehelichter Stand"<sup>3)</sup>, or when a number of critics tried to make a

<sup>1)</sup> *The Modern Study of Literature*, p. 494.

<sup>2)</sup> *Wilhelm Meister*, IV. 14.

<sup>3)</sup> Quoted by Loening: *Die Hamlet-tragödie*, p. 256.



lunatic of Hamlet, they no doubt applied or believed they applied inductive methods. Goethe, for instance, based his opinion on the 'fact' of Ophelia's father and brother being uneasy about her reputation, but who that has lovingly studied that wonderful play is willing to take seriously for a moment the theory that reduces it to a story of a lunatic and an unchaste girl?

I shall now try to discuss what results Moulton himself has obtained by applying his methods to *The Merchant of Venice*. One thing must strike even the casual reader of Moulton's essay at once: his tendency towards generalization, his eagerness to discover problems. I believe that this is looking at Shakespeare through nineteenth century spectacles. "The drama in the age of Elizabeth", says Prof. Dowden, "is the outcome of a rich and manifold life; it is full of a sense of enjoyment, and overflowing with energy; but it is for the most part absolutely devoid of a conscious purpose."<sup>1</sup>) And in another place<sup>2</sup>) he writes: "The vital centre of Shakespeare's comedies is not an idea, an abstraction, a doctrine, a moral thesis, but something concrete — persons involved in action." Moulton's habit of looking at Shakespeare's work comes out clearly in such a sentence as this: "Personages such as Gratiano, Salanio, Salarino, Tubal serve to keep before us the mediaeval feud between Jew and Gentile, and the persecuting insolence with which the fashionable youth met the moneylenders<sup>3</sup>) who ministered to their necessities." Now to those who read Shakespeare as Prof. Dowden reads him, all these characters serve in the first place to show how one individual moneylender Shylock was gradually driven to madness; with hostile social groups the play is not concerned at all, although of course it assumes them.

However, it is not merely here and there that this problem-finding tendency comes out, it underlies the whole of the book. In both of the two main plots Moulton has discovered general motives. "In the story of the Jew the main point is its special capability for bringing out the idea of *Nemesis*, one of the simplest and most universal of dramatic motives." Shylock's sin is evident and his nemesis comes upon him in the trial scene; for Antonio a sin is found in the first scene. He is guilty of no less than *hybris*, which in the antique world was sufficient to bring the severest punishment of the gods on mortals. To prove this Moulton leaves the solid ground of inductive criticism for a moment. He points out that Antonio is barely polite to the men that fawn on him — he is probably much politer than most patrons of the days of Elizabeth were to people dependent on them — but when they refer to the cares incident on Antonio's commercial undertakings, Moulton says '*Antonio draws himself up*' and then gives the words Antonio addresses to them. Now it is evident that in the words just quoted we see Moulton's subjective opinion as to the way in which this passage should be understood. But I believe that few would agree with him and I do not remember having ever seen Antonio represented on the stage in this way. And with good reason, for it is requisite that the spectator should get a favourable impression of Antonio from the beginning and not that of a purse-proud and slightly-arrogant merchant. In accordance with this, Shakespeare is careful not to show Antonio at his worst, if he has spat upon the Jew, we are spared the sight of it. Not one of the characters considers

<sup>1</sup>) Dowden. *Shakspeare. His Mind and Art*. p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>) E. Dowden, *Shakespeare as a Comic Dramatist*. (in C. M. Gayley. Representative English Comedies. Vol. I. p. 638.)

<sup>3</sup>) The plural is characteristic.

him as a sinner: there is not a word to indicate it and after the trial his attitude is not that of a man who has escaped punishment. To Prof. Moulton, however, there is no doubt that Shakespeare intended Antonio to be a sinner who deserved serious punishment and he goes on to point out how the play is also a nemesis on a nemesis: "The nemesis which visits Antonio's fault is the crime for which Shylock suffers his nemesis." Here it seems Moulton has succeeded in making intricate what is in reality simple. The dramatic possibilities of the pound of flesh story were to Shakespeare obvious: a rich and good man suddenly becomes poor, he is at the mercy of a cruel usurer and is restored to fortune. As far as the story goes, little else was wanted to keep the spectators interested; to Shakespeare, the artist, we may safely suppose that the possibilities of characterization which the two main personages offered, must have been the greatest attraction.

In the Caskets-story the ingenuity of Prof. Moulton has again discovered a problem. "The point of the Caskets Story to the eyes of an artist in Drama is the opportunity it affords for . . . an idealisation of the commonest problem in every day experience — what may be called the Problem of Judgment by Appearances." And after Moulton has tried to prove his point, he winds up by saying: "Shakespeare's contribution to the question of practical judgment is that by the long exercise of commonplace qualities we are building up a character which, though unconsciously, is the determining force in the emergencies in which commonplace qualities are impossible." "Shakespeare's contribution to the question of practical judgment" does it not sound, as if *The Merchant of Venice* were an academical thesis? Again, how hopelessly far away we are from Belmont and all that Belmont suggests. Now, what other answer can be given to the two principal questions that are raised by the Caskets-story? They are: 1. Why did Shakespeare choose to couple this with that of the Jew and the pound of flesh? and 2. What are the dramatic possibilities of the story? The answer to the first question is to me simply this, that the pound of flesh story, which is obviously unfit for serious, tragic treatment, is equally unfit to be used by itself as the plot of a comedy: it is too nearly tragic for the second purpose, it is also too meagre in incident. To Shakespeare love was an indispensable element in comedy, his genius saw the possibility of combining a somewhat childish love-story with a story of flesh and blood into one glorious whole. With respect to the second question I venture to suggest that the main effect of the caskets-episode, assisted by the boy and girl love of Lorenzo and Jessica, is that it raises the whole play into that atmosphere of semi-reality which pervades nearly all of Shakespeare's comedies and, it may be added, which can be traced down through the history of the English drama from Lyly to Sir James Barrie. In this atmosphere of semi-reality the ghastly story of the Jew becomes delightful, just as in fairy-tales the ogre or Blue-beard are not repulsive realities. An argument in favour of this hypothesis may be found in the fact that Shakespeare, after the first scene in which Bassanio obtains Antonio's permission to borrow money in his name, shifts the place of action to Belmont, although the third scene in which Antonio agrees to the bond might logically be expected to follow, in other words: in the opening scenes the attention of the spectators is mainly occupied with the idyllic subplot, not with the main plot.

Quite in accordance with Moulton's habits of generalization is his fondness for discovering groups of characters. To him it seems certain that the minor personages are nearly all given a more or less important part in the Jessica-

story in order to group them together. But would any play-goer of average intellect ever think of Salanio, Tubal and Lancelot as belonging to one group? Again, in the three suitors Moulton discovers different manifestations of pride. From Bassanio's words:

but thou, thou meagre lead,  
Which rather threat'nest than dost promise aught,  
Thy paleness moves me more than eloquence,

Moulton concludes that his pride is that of the soldier, but the rest of the speech, which Moulton ignores, brings out quite a different and much more important quality: Bassanio hates false show, he is in search of realities, and that is why he is the right lover for Portia. What was the artistic problem which Shakespeare had before him in the suitors? It was how to make the same action which had to be repeated three times<sup>1)</sup>, interesting and then, how to enlist the sympathy of the spectators for Bassanio. Shakespeare provided the necessary variety by individualizing the characters. It was not necessary to go very far out of his way for this, it was not desirable even to spend too much energy on the delineation of the first two characters, for that would only divert the attention from the main part of the action. Two easily recognizable types served the purpose best. Hence Shakespeare made of Morocco a braggadocio, and of Arragon a foolish fortune-hunter. After these two men had made their choice, every one would applaud Bassanio's good luck. All further analysis of the characters of Morocco and Arragon seems to me gratuitous.

It almost goes without saying that to Moulton Jessica and Lorenzo are meant to set off Portia and Bassanio. Even their fortunes are neatly balanced. "Both are happy for ever, and both have become so through a bold stroke. Yet in the one instance it is blind obedience, in face of all temptations, to the mere whims of a good parent, who is dead, that has been guided to the one issue so passionately desired; in the case of the other couple open rebellion, at every practical risk, against the legitimate authority of an evil father, still living, has brought them no worse fate than happiness in one another, and for their defenceless position the best of patrons." All this is, no doubt, very ingenious and perhaps there are those who are willing to accept Portia's 'blind obedience' as a 'bold stroke', but to me all this is absolutely beside the point, which is, that the Jessica-story assists the idyllic part of the plot to which it *belongs from the very beginning*. To Moulton, preoccupied with questions of technique, the Jessica-Lorenzo story is switched on to the story of the caskets at the moment when the two young lovers are present in Belmont in the body. Of course there is hardly any doubt possible that Shakespeare introduced the Jessica-story in the first place because it helps us to understand Shylock's fury, but it is impossible for me to believe that the story of these two young lovers only begins to form part of the lighter story at the end of their honeymoon and that Shakespeare simply added them to the caskets-story to "make the balance true." They drifted to Belmont as to their natural home.

One more proof may be given of Moulton's habit of finding problems. Even the humorous episode of the rings affords an opportunity for philosophic speculations: — "The affair of the rings, slight as it is, is so managed by Portia that its point becomes a test as between his friendship and his love." Now if we must find some problem here, I would suggest that it is much more a test between his gratitude to the lawyer and loyalty to the promise made to Portia and that the hesitation which is the natural

<sup>1)</sup> A threefold repetition lends itself best to bring out a climax, a twofold repetition to bring out a contrast.



consequence of this is enough to make the spectators eagerly watch the scene. However, analysis of this kind can only mislead us: we discover the problem and we overlook the fact that in moments like that in which Bassanio had to decide whether he should part with the ring or not, there are all kinds of feelings and thoughts at the background of our minds; in other words purely rational analysis when carried too far only hampers our imaginative understanding of such delightful short scenes. Besides, we are in no small danger of discovering difficulties where there are none. That Prof. Moulton has not escaped this danger I shall now try to show.

The story of the pound of flesh is, according to Moulton, of the greatest difficulty to handle dramatically. As we shall see, Moulton's difficulties are all based on the fact that when analysed logically the whole story is nought. But the play was written for the average play-goer, who, as Charles Lamb would have put it, is a 'bundle of prejudices' and, we may add, vague feelings and longings. It is, so it seems to me, one of the fundamental weaknesses of Moulton's essay that he underrates enormously the emotional side of the characters of ordinary mortals, indeed he almost seems to ignore it. The difficulties that confronted the dramatist in the story of the bond are, according to Moulton, fourfold. "That such a bond should be proposed, that when proposed it should be accepted, that it should be seriously entertained by a court of justice, that if entertained at all it should be upset on so frivolous a pretext as the omission of reference to the shedding of blood." Now, if Shakespeare had been the inventor of the plot these difficulties would indeed have been almost, if not quite, unsurmountable. But the question becomes entirely different, if the story is well-known to the spectators. As this was certainly the case, Moulton's formidable difficulties were solved before the play began and Shakespeare must have felt that by putting such an improbable story on the stage he risked nothing. The audience were just delighted to see in the flesh before their eyes the unfortunate merchant and the cruel Jew, about whom ballads were sung and of whom they had probably already heard when they were children. If we keep this in mind, we shall not want Moulton's hyper-ingenious reasoning to understand that these difficulties were easily surmounted.

The first difficulty, then, is that the bond should be proposed. To Moulton it is clear that Shakespeare has introduced Shylock's story of the ewes and rams to make the spectators forget "the total incongruity between such an idea as a pound of human flesh and commercial transactions of any kind." This talk suddenly "flashes into Shylock's mind the suggestion of the bond." Now the whole of this scene can be viewed differently. When Antonio wants to borrow money from Shylock, it is but natural that the latter should avail himself of the opportunity to vent some of his spleen and to remind him sarcastically of his principles. A discussion of these principles naturally follows, and, as usual in argument, one of the contestants appeals to the highest authority recognised by his opponent. Hence Shylock quotes the story from the Old Testament, with which as a Jew he is most familiar. The debate is strange to us, because there is to us no similarity of any kind between money increasing by interest and the way in which a flock of sheep grows larger. Prof. Moulton has done us a real service by explaining the mediaeval conception of interest, some of which no doubt lingered on in the days of Shakespeare. Hence to an Elizabethan audience Shylock's way of proving the permissibility of taking interest did not sound strange. As to the proposal of the bond, if it is not assumed that the spectators' familiarity with the story had sufficiently paved the way, so that it was necessary for Shakespeare to avoid causing

the spectators too great a shock, it was done in another way. Any one who has ever been a witness to some violent quarrel in which he was himself a spectator, will know, if he is at all in the habit of watching the working of his own mind, that in such moments our critical powers are in abeyance. Shakespeare no doubt felt that after that famous outburst of mutual hatred between Antonio and Shylock, the proposal of the bond was dramatically safe. Apart from this there is, I think, something quite wrong in the whole of Moulton's argument: Antonio's flesh is not proposed as interest, as Moulton says. He puts into Shylock's mouth the words: "Suppose I take as my interest in this bond a pound of your own flesh". (pag. 64.) Whether this is compatible with the inductive method in which Prof. Moulton is such a fervent believer, is to me not very important. But I feel sure that the way in which Moulton gets over the difficulty and which to me is little better than intellectual legerdemain is inadmissible whatever method one chooses to apply. The whole passage is too long to quote here, so that I must refer the reader to pp. 63/64 of Moulton's book. Suffice it to say that Prof. Moulton first says that the two parties consider "the distinction between the using of flesh and metal for the *medium of wealth* <sup>1)</sup> to be the essential point in the dispute", that with the notion of flesh *versus* money floating in the air the interview goes on to the outbursts of hatred and leads up to the proposal of the bond, and finally substitutes for *medium of wealth* the word *interest* in the sentence quoted above. But the taking of the pound of flesh is suggested as a 'forfeit' i.e. in this case as a punishment, a notion with which the Elizabethans were familiar enough as the time-honoured phrase "on pain of death" is sufficient to show; and besides, Shylock says expressly that he will *not* take interest.

The second difficulty which Moulton discovers in the story of the bond is that Antonio should accept it. I would suggest that we are sufficiently prepared for this by the first scene, in which in accordance with his general practice Shakespeare has been careful to bring out precisely those qualities of Antonio's character with which it is necessary for us to be acquainted, if we want to understand what follows. The idea could hardly enter Antonio's mind that one day he too might be poor; we feel that such a man must be willing to accept any bond. Anyhow I feel sure that one of the reasons Moulton gives why Antonio is found willing to accept the bond, cannot be accepted. He says: "When one who is manifestly an injured man is the first to make advances, a generous adversary finds it almost impossible to hold back". This would imply that to Antonio Shylock was 'manifestly an injured man', a supposition which to me seems quite untenable. There is not a trace of any such feeling being present in Antonio's mind here or anywhere else in the play; to Antonio it never so much as occurs that he may not have been fair to Shylock or that there was something to be said for the Jew's attitude towards him.

"That the bond should be seriously entertained" is Moulton's third difficulty. It would perhaps have been one, if Shakespeare's audience had consisted of lawyers. And again, I believe, Moulton's ingenuity leads him astray. "At the opening of the trial", Moulton says, "the Duke gives expression to the universal opinion that Shylock's conduct was intelligible only on the supposition that he was keeping up to the last moment the appearance of insisting on his strange terms, in order that before the eyes of the whole city he might exhibit his enemy at his mercy, and then add

<sup>1)</sup> The italics are mine.

to his ignominy by publicly pardoning him." "This will explain", Moulton adds, "how Shylock comes to have a hearing at all." But the words the Duke had spoken to Antonio before Shylock came in leave no doubt as to the question, if the Duke believes that Shylock is in earnest or not, for he says:

I am sorry for thee: thou art come to answer  
A stony adversary, an inhuman wretch  
Uncapable of pity, void and empty  
From any dram of mercy.

(Act. IV. 1. 3ff.)

Why then should the Duke address the words to Shylock from which Moulton would draw the conclusion referred to just now? The answer is, I believe, obvious. It is exactly what every one does who wants to persuade somebody to relent. Translated into everyday language the Duke's words simply mean: "Come, Shylock, you are not serious!"

The last difficulty mentioned by Prof. Moulton is that the bond should be upset by a quibble. Moulton's argument is that Shakespeare got over it by putting it in the mouth of a woman and by following it up with a "sound, legal plea." Again we see that Moulton, who fondly thinks that his method is not subjective, assumes an audience with powers of logical analysis equal or, since they have to realize all this while they are looking on at the play, superior to his own. A much simpler explanation why the legal or logical insufficiency of the quibble passes unnoticed on the stage is that the audience eagerly expected to hear what they knew was coming, just as children will clap their hands, when Little Red Riding-Hood is restored to life. And even if the story had not been wellknown, the audience would have welcomed any trick by which the merchant was delivered from the cruelty of his adversary. To me it seems that there is another more serious difficulty here and a difficulty which will not so easily pass unnoticed: the answer to the quibble seems so easy to give, why has Shylock nothing to say? Why does he submit at once? It is obvious that if Shylock had given the answer we should expect, it would have been difficult if not impossible for Portia to hold her ground. Did Shakespeare, the playwright, feel that the audience would accept the quibble for the reasons given above? Anyhow Shakespeare, the poet, may have considered Shylock's tame submission after the quibble to be what we should expect, for with his acute intellect Shylock must have felt that he was lost as soon as these hateful Christians had found a pretext to get rid of the bond.

It goes without saying that the number of difficulties is not exhausted with the four discussed above. Moulton thinks that the three months' interval between the signing of the bond and its forfeiture is a rather serious one in this case. It is, I believe, sufficient to say that the practice of Elizabethan dramatists shows that the difficulty was not much felt as such. The mystery-plays, which many playgoers of Shakespeare's days must have seen, put a much greater strain on their imagination in this respect. However, something may be said in favour of Moulton's suggestion that Shakespeare bridged over the three months' interval with the help of the bustle and stir of the second act. The question would involve an investigation of Shakespeare's practice in the rest of his dramatic work and so cannot be adequately discussed in this article.

I have already referred to what I can only call Moulton's hyper-ingenuity. A case in point seems to me the long argument about the dramatic function



of the sub-plot. Moulton tries to prove that by combining a light and a serious story Shakespeare has been able to make Portia the deliverer and that consequently "the dramatist has been able to extract more tragic effect" out of the serious plot. Now to me it seems that any deliverer, recognized as such by the audience, even the time-honoured *deus ex machina*, would have served the same purpose. Nor do I agree with Moulton's statement that if the trial-scene had been intended to have a tragic termination this prolonging of its details would have been impossible: "thus to harrow our feelings with items of agony would be not art but barbarity." (p. 72) But an audience that could bear to see the strangling of Desdemona or the horrors of Massinger's *Virgin Martyr* must have had somewhat stronger nerves than Moulton gives them credit for. Besides, if a classic audience could contemplate the happiness of Oedipus, knowing how it would all end, if the same play can be acted in our days and be enjoyed as art, why must we suppose that an Elizabethan audience could not stand without special precautions the somewhat melodramatic part of the trial-scene of which they knew before the play began that it would end well?

Moulton, it seems to me, is again over-ingenuous where he explains why Bassanio should go to Shylock to borrow money. "As a gay young nobleman he knows nothing of the commercial world except the money-lenders, and now proceeds to the best-known of them, apparently unaware of what any gossip on the Rialto could have told him, the unfortunate relations between this Shylock and his friend Antonio." But this to me is solving a difficulty by putting a much greater one in its stead. Can we not simply say that there is an unimportant blemish here, something not more serious than an oversight? For a few simple words between Antonio and Shylock in the first scene about the difficulty of getting money and the necessity of going to Shylock would have solved the difficulty. And again — it is an imperfection that only strikes the reader; in the theatre the attention of the audience is far too much occupied with Shylock and his antagonist for the blemish to be noticed. Perhaps I may here draw the reader's attention to another remark made by Moulton with respect to the same scene, not because of its importance, but because it brings out clearly, how Moulton, too, albeit unconsciously, leaves the solid ground of fact simply by visualising the scene. Bassanio has asked Shylock for the money. "At this juncture," says Moulton (p. 61), "Antonio himself falls in with them, sees at a glance to what his rash friend has committed him, but is too proud to draw back in sight of the enemy." Now of all this there is nothing whatever in the text. There is not the slightest indication of Antonio's being surprised, one might with more probability come to quite a different conclusion. When Shylock sees Antonio and asks: "Who is he comes here?", Bassanio answers: "This is Signior Antonio." If this sentence is read with strong stress on 'is', it would rather suggest that Bassanio and Antonio had talked the thing over before. Antonio's meeting them might also be attributed to the same cause, for Bassanio does not show the slightest surprise at meeting his friend so opportunely. I do not mean to suggest that the scene should be interpreted in this way, I only mean to show that Prof. Moulton's methods are not always so different from those of his opponents as he thinks.

It is one of the laws of the serious drama that it should embody a complete action, in which are discoverable a beginning, a middle and an end. The study of Shakespeare's method with respect to all three is of absorbing interest. Prof. Moulton has in the essay under discussion restricted himself to a few remarks, made more or less in passing, on the centre or crisis of

*The Merchant of Venice*. His hypothesis is that Shakespeare followed his favourite practice of placing the crisis "in the exact mechanical centre of the drama". The danger of such a general statement is obvious. As soon as we begin to believe in it, we unconsciously try to make the facts suit the theory. Nor is it to be wondered at that Prof. Moulton often discovers the crisis in other places than most readers or play-goers. In *Julius Caesar* for instance he asserts that the stage-direction: *Enter a servant* marks the crisis. The ingenuity with which Moulton argues the point, has a certain fascination, but not every one is willing to accept at once as truth what ruthless logic seems to teach. In *The Merchant of Venice* there is, according to Moulton, an *apparent crisis*, the trial scene, and the *real crisis*, the caskets-scene. Prof. Moulton's argument is that in the first place "the Complication and Resolution in the story of the Jew serve for the Complication and Resolution of the drama as a whole" and in the second place that the trial-scene in reality depends on the caskets-scene. Now the first of these two statements is to me intelligible only in so far that the story of the Merchant and the Jew is more important than the caskets-story, but if it is meant to show that as far as the construction of the play goes only the story of the Jew matters, I confess that I do not understand it. As to the second statement, the same argument might serve to show that the real crisis is in the first act, for if Antonio had not consented to help his friend, nothing would have come of the caskets-scene. Of course nobody can deny that the caskets-scene is a kind of pivot in the action, it is demonstrably that, but that it should be the crisis in the Antonio-Shylock plot, no amount of logic will ever make me believe. But is it absolutely necessary to accept one crisis? Shakespeare wrote his plays apparently guided almost exclusively by his own intellect and instinct and with an absolute disregard of nearly all the rules his learned contemporaries held well-nigh sacred. Is it heresy to assume that in *The Merchant of Venice* there are two turning-points in the action, two crises, each of the two main-plots having its own beginning, middle and end? Those to whom this is too startling a suggestion, may then find consolation in the reflection that the more tragic and passionate nature of the plot of the Jew leads up to a crisis of greater intensity than the idyllic subplot concerned with Bassanio and Portia — and that consequently there is one main crisis. We may then add that Shakespeare's genius wove the plots together into such a close whole that to his spectators and readers it must seem that there is really an organic and inevitable connection between them, and that this effect was brought about also by the device of establishing a connecting-link between the two crises.

I cannot finish this article without making one general remark. Just as a great work of literary art is invested with something that defies analysis and that we can only call atmosphere, the works of the great critics suggest much more than meets the eye, their writings take colour from what they discuss. Thus in Bradley's great book we move in an atmosphere resembling that of Shakespeare's own tragedies. In reading Prof. Moulton's book I am continually conscious of a mental activity entirely different from that which the reading of Shakespeare himself produces. No doubt this is partly due to Moulton's scientific language, of which a few specimens may suffice. Much better than Lorenzo himself, Prof. Moulton knows what drew him to Jessica, of whom he says: "her outer beauty is the index of artistic sensibility within: she is never merry, when she hears sweet music", and "the soul of rhythm is awakened in her, just as much as in her husband, by the moonlight scene." Surely Prof. Moulton ought to know that it is the

moonlight itself which exercises its magic influence on those two lovers in the garden at Belmont. Again of the concluding scene Prof. Moulton remarks: "An explanation must somehow be given to Bassanio that the lawyer is Portia in disguise; mere mechanical explanations have always an air of weakness, but *the affair of the rings utilises the explanation in the present case as a source of new dramatic effects*<sup>1)</sup>." Now all this is to me hopelessly true, but who can read this and not forget the playful grace of that inimitable closing scene. In one passage Prof. Moulton is guilty of what to me is nothing less than an enormity. When comparing Portia and Bassanio with Lorenzo and Jessica, he says of the latter couple that they "are negative characters with the one positive quality of intense capacity for enjoyment." Such a sentence makes us thankful that Prof. Moulton has not applied his methods to lyric poetry. Romeo and Juliet, Aucassin and Nicolette, Paolo and Francesca — negative characters with an intense capacity for enjoyment! But to the greatest poets and painters these 'negative characters' have always been of entrancing interest; for they felt instinctively that genius takes many forms. To Rossetti the beauty of his wife is genius<sup>2)</sup>, and the history of the human race can boast a long list of men in whom character was genius, but is there for the soul of man a higher elevation imaginable than the genius of being able to love perfectly? If I should try to put in a few words all that Jessica to me stands for, I should not be able to do this better than by borrowing the opening line of another of Rossetti's sonnets and saying:

Jessica, I thank thee for thy loveliness.

The Hague, May 1924.

J. H. SCHUTT.

## Notes and News.

**Editorial.** The seventh volume of *English Studies* will be marked by some slight changes in the manner of publication, and by an important addition to the contents. It has been decided to return to the original plan of six bi-monthly issues of thirty-two pages each. The June and August numbers will no longer be combined. The *Translation* will be converted into a separate Supplement within the same cover with the rest of the journal, of which it will remain an integral part. It will not be separately obtainable.

The February number will contain the first of a series of articles under the general title of **A Guide to English Studies**, presenting a methodological and bibliographical survey of the study of English language and literature, and of ancillary subjects such as history and institutions. The following is the scheme of the chapters on *Language* which will be contributed by Dr. E. Kruisinga:

- I. Introduction.
- II. The Study of Present English.
  1. Standard Southern English (colloquial and literary).
  2. Varieties of Present English.
- III. The Study of Old and Middle English.

<sup>1)</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>2)</sup> Sonnet XVIII.



#### IV. The History of English.

1. The study of speech and the study of a language.
2. The history of English sounds, inflections and syntax.
3. History of the vocabulary; the study of names; history of writing (including palaeography).

Dr. E. Kruisinga will also contribute a chapter on *History and Institutions*, dealing mainly with

Political Institutions (Parliament and Local Government).  
Law: its character, administration, and the study of law.  
The Church.  
Education.

*Literature* will be treated in a series of chapters each covering a period. *Mediaeval Literature* will be dealt with by Mr. J. H. Schutt; *Romanticism* by [Mr. J. Kooistra. Mr. A. G. van Kranendonk will contribute an article on *Modern Prose*; Mr. W. van Doorn will write on *Modern Poetry*. Further chapters will be announced in due course. The order of publication will not necessarily be chronological.

We believe that the **Guide** will be of real service to many students of English. It need hardly be said that the other features of *English Studies* will all be retained.

---

**English Association in Holland.** The session was opened by a series of demonstrations of *English Folk Dances*: Sword Dances — Morris Dances — Country Dances, by members of the English Folk Dance Society. The performances, which were given at Amsterdam, Haarlem, Hilversum and Nijmegen, were a very great success.

Lectures have been given by Capt. W. Chandler, on *London and Cornwall and Devon*, at The Hague, Utrecht, Arnhem, Groningen, Enschede, Dordrecht, Sneek and Zutphen; by Mr. Ernest Rhys on *Modern Fiction and Old Folktale*, at Enschede, Haarlem and Hilversum; and by Prof. H. B. Charlton, of the University of Manchester, on *Poetry and the Plain Man*, at Groningen, Nijmegen, Leiden, Dordrecht and Flushing. Professor Charlton has also lectured to the *Vereniging „Moderne Talen”* at The Hague, on *The Art of Reading Poetry*.

The programme for Easter Term includes illustrated lectures by Mr. R. Gleadowe, of the National Gallery, London, on *British Painters*; lecture-recitals on *Poetry and Music* by Steuart Wilson; and lectures on *The Importance of the Seventeenth Century in English History* by Mr. E. R. Adair, of University College, London.

---

## Translation.

1. There was also the fear of poverty.
2. It was only July, but there was already the dread of poverty, which as a rule did not come until winter.
3. When the deacons met they did not conceal from themselves how matters would stand in winter and they took measures to retrench expenses; but how could they economize when already there was so much poverty?
4. At the meeting of deacons Kieft, who had never yet been in receipt of parochial relief, had stood at the door, cap in hand, till the deacons had told him to come forward and then he had kept his eyes (fixed) on

the ground like a man about to commit a crime; and the deacons had told him that he need not speak, they knew all about it. 5. Nor need he feel ashamed, for who knows but they themselves would be in the same predicament this very year? 6. This had comforted Kieft and it had seemed to him as if a weight of shame had been lifted from him by the kindness of the brethren.

7. But this was only the beginning of the poverty.

8. After Kieft there had been no other applicant for relief, but the deacons understood that they must go uninvited to some houses and give; for who else would bear the humiliation as Kieft had done? 9. Thus the deacons were spending money when they should have been economizing. 10. In their fear of what more might be in store for them the people talked to each other when they walked home from church; they talked about the sermon in connection with the coming distress. 11. If some point had been raised bearing on it it was quoted and discussed on the walk home, but they went about and talked like people walking in their sleep. 12. When three or four people stood together at the bridge they put their heads together, but four were no wiser than one.

13. Then it was proposed to hold a day of special prayer. 14. Who had been the first to suggest it? 15. No one knew. 16. They had talked about it in Sieds's public house and in the parish council before the meeting began. 17. Who could say who was the first to suggest it?

18. But one day something occurred that filled the members of the Reformed Church with a great respect for their pastor. 19. They had seen Walter leave his house and go straight to Senseff's vicarage; they had seen him ring the bell and go in. 20. The next Sunday the whole community knew, for it was announced from both pulpits with (the) consent of the respective churchwardens that on the following Wednesday a day of prayer would be held by all the people, both Reformed and Dissenters, and that there would be services in both Churches simultaneously.

**Observations.** 1. *Fear for poverty.* The usual preposition seems to be *of*; at least *for* is not recorded in N. E. D. We might say, however, 'the doctor feared *for* his life'. *Apprehension - Fear - Dread.* The sentiment of *apprehension* is simply that of uneasiness, that of *fear* is anxiety, that of *dread* is wretchedness. We *apprehend* an unpleasant occurrence, we *fear* a misfortune, we *dread* a calamity. (Crabb). The definite article must be used before the word because it is qualified.

2. *Which usually came only towards winter.*

3. In undertaking the task of writing such a work I did not *disguise from myself* the difficulty of what lay before me. (H. C. Wyld: Historical Study of the Mother-Tongue.). I cannot *disguise from myself* the fact that if you lose your soul God will hold me responsible. (Geo. Moore: The Lake, p. 139.). She could not *conceal from herself* that the prospect had something ignominious about it. (D. Gerard: Eternal Woman.). *The deacons were fully conscious of the gravity of the situation.* — He could not save, he did not know how to *economize*. (J. O. Hobbes: Love and the Soul hunters, p. 118.). The Air Ministry has *economized* half a million on technical and war stores. (Times Weekly Ed. 17. 12. '20.). At a London County evening class at Tower Bridge instruction is given to housewives, in the mending of pots and pans in order to *effect economy* in the home. (Ibidem). But my income being too small to defray my expense, I was obliged to *retrench*. (Smollett: Roderick Random Ch. XXIII.). Mrs. Bute began to save and *retrench* with all her might (Thackeray: Vanity Fair.). — There was great *distress* here among

the poor (Dickens 'Letters', quoted N. E. D.). The bank will bankrupt me if I cannot pay it off by the end of the year. Will your lordship please help me in my *distress*? (Times 17. 12. '20.).

4. By and by Mrs. Wake entered the room, *candle in hand*. (Thomas Hardy: The Waiting Supper.). — *Had stood by the door* is correct: Both men were standing by the door and in shadow. (L. J. Beeston: Wine of Sensation.). — A couple of beaters *came forward* and stooped down to examine the trail (M. Crawford: Mr. Isaacs) "What have you brought me here for?" "That you shall know at once. *Come forward!*" (Strand Magazine March 1921. p. 275.). Law, with beating heart, *came forward* into the circle of lamplight. (Richmal Crompton: Recompense.). In a different sense: Our young men have already *come forward* to defend the fatherland. (Times History of the War I. 315.). *Come to the fore* conveys a different idea (= come to the front): These vexed questions of local taxation must *come to the fore* next session. (Manchester Guardian 23. 11. '80.). Mr. Ruskin *comes to the fore* with some characteristic remarks on the education of children (New York Tribune 2. 4. '86.). These vermin seldom venture to *come to the fore*. The young member of Hertford began to *come to the front* (Strand Magazine March 1898. 332.). [= begon van zich te doen spreken.]. — She looked at me with sudden keenness and then *dropped her eyes* [oogen neerslaan] (Stanley Weyman: Under the Red Robe, Zwolle edition p. 54.). Something more solid which tinkled sharply on the boards as it fell. I *looked down* to see what it was. (Ibidem p. 68.). She moved all of a piece; and shame and exhaustion were expressed in every line of her fresh young body, and she *held her head down* and *kept her eyes upon the pavement* as she came slowly forward. (Stevenson: The Sire de Malétroit's Door.). — *Come nearer* is correct. — *He needed not speak*. In the literary language *needed not* and *did not need* are both admissible but must be followed by an infinitive with *to*. See Kruisinga, Handbook § 398 ff.

5. *He need not feel ashamed either, for who could say that the deacons themselves would not be reduced to the same predicament that very year*. Who knows that.... not = Who knows but.... Who knows but this night-walking old fellow may be in the habit of haunting every visitor? (Dolf Heylinger.). Who knows but the old lady thought of her own early days. (Pendennis II. Ch. XXXVII). See Poutsma, Grammar of Late Modern English I, p. 405.

6. *To Freddy it had seemed* as though he himself hung there somehow, sheer in space (Harry Harper: The Flying Pearls.). — *Brothers-Brethren*. The latter word is preferred in more solemn senses. In some grammars the statement is made that the plural *brothers* implies a blood-relation, *brethren* a community. That this view is incorrect will appear from the following quotations: The soldier and the officer became friends and *brothers-in-arms*. (Strand Magazine, Aug. 1894, p. 119.). He had bidden his former *brethren-in-arms* a farewell (Thomas Hardy: A Changed Man.). I pray you all to love together Like *brethren*. (Tennyson: Queen Mary, p. 205.). — *Rehabilitate*: He was going to take advantage of the fatted calves and other resources of *rehabilitated* prodigals (W. J. Locke: Idols, Ch. II.). Gifts of clothing, which often serve to *rehabilitate* some poor fellow in both senses of the word. (Strand Magazine, January 1905, p. 84.).

7. *Poverty*. In the opening sentence of our text *poverty* is not preceded by the definite article, the word being thought of entirely in the abstract. In the present sentence, however, the word is individualized and the article is accordingly required before it. Compare: And God said: "Let there be



*light* and there was light. And God saw *the light* that- it was good." (Genesis I, 3—5; quoted from Poutsma II, Ch. XXXI, 5.).

8. You arrive *uninvited* but, believe me, very welcome (R. L. Stevenson: The Sire de Malétroit's Door.). — *Like Kieft* — *As Kieft had done* — *Like Kieft had done*. As appertains to verbs, *like* to nouns. One thing is *like* another, you do a thing *as* some one else does it. However the use of *like* instead of *as* (that is to say in the function of a conjunction) is coming into popular use: He is resting *like* I am (Story Teller, June 1912, p. 404.). I am not prejudiced *like* you are (Lanoe Falconer: Madame Ixe.). Fancy a dirty drab *like* you going to the King's palace. Such a little scrub of a sister *as* you! (Both from "Book for the Bairns" No. 7, p. 5.). They are ladies and I take care that they shall behave *as* ladies. (identity). He broke his promise and behaved *like* a bear. (comparison). *Like* our own Tommies the German soldier in war time expresses his humour in cryptic phrases. (Nelson, *The War*, Oct. 17, 1914). *Like* you I must wait patiently. (Foxwell: Munition Lasses, p. 48.). The narrowness and ungenerosity which could so determinedly shut the door in the face of an humble penitent *like* me. (Jessie Fothergill: The First Violin, p. 69.). *Like* the male glow-worms they are attracted by fires. (Strand Magazine, Dec. 1904, p. 722).

9. *Whereas they should have been economizing*.

10. *As they walked home*. *As* is impossible here. To express that an action or a state is habitual *when* should be used: Our sermon books are shut up, *when* Miss Crawley arrives. (Vanity Fair). He rattled the halfpence in his pocket *as* he walked homeward. See Poutsma I, p. 437ff. — *There was talked about the sermon*. Wrong! The passive in English differs from the active voice in being always personal, i. e. the subject must be a noun or pronoun referring to a person, thing or sentence. Of course it would be right to say: "There was a great deal of nonsense talked about the sermon" but in this sentence the real subject is not the introductory *there*, but 'a great deal of nonsense', hence the construction is personal, as in: There were mistakes made. Compare the English renderings of "Er wordt gelachen, geklopt, gebeld," etc. and see Kruisinga, Handbook, § 183.

11. *If there had been allusion to it in the sermon*. There's just one point I should like to *touch upon* (Gissing: Our Friend the Charlatan Ch. VI.). — *Quote - Cite*: Smith (*Synonyms Discriminated*) has the following passage on these words: "We use the term *cite* when the mind dwells primarily upon the matter imported, *quote* when we think of the precise words". Crabb holds that "*cite* is employed for persons or things, *quote* for things only". The Century Dictionary confirms Smith's view: "When we *quote* or *recite* we repeat the exact words, when we *cite* or *adduce* we may only refer to the passage without *quoting* it". We may *quote* or *cite* Shakespeare. — *Deal with - Treat*: The second part *deals with* inequalities, approximations and errors, de Moivre's theorem and series. Some sections are *treated* rather more fully than usual (Cambridge Bulletin.). I am sending you catalogue, *dealing with* English literature. The citizen should give careful attention to the claims of the candidates proposed, he should ascertain their ability to *deal with* the complicated questions. (Parrott: The Life and Duties of the Citizen, p. 30.).

12. When I went to the door and opened it she followed mechanically. An instant, and the door fell to behind us, shutting off the light and glow, and we *stood together* in the growing dusk (S. Weyman: Under the Red Robe) *Laid their heads together*: N.E.D. defines 'confer together'. Then they *laid their heads together* and whispered their own version of the story. (Besant).

They *laid their heads together* and gradually built up this picturesque mountain of lies (Oxford Dictionary). We "laid our heads together" — that is, compared notes and results — and very speedily decided on the course of action to be pursued. (McGovan: *Brought to Bay*, p. 77.).

14. *Start the question, broach the subject*. The subject of a dance having been *broached*, to put the thought in practice was the feeling of all. (T. Hardy: *Enter a Dragoon*.).

16. *Sieds'(s) public house*. Sir James Murray in *Rules for Compositors* lays down the following rule: 'Use *'s* for the possessive case in English names and surnames whenever possible; i.e. in all monosyllables and disyllables, and in longer words accented on the penult; as *Augustus's*, *Charles's*, *Cousins's*, *Gustavus's*, *Hicks's*, *St. James's Square*, *Nicodemus's*, *Jones's*, *Thomas's*. In longer names, not accented on the penult, *'s* is also preferable, though *'* is here admissible; e.g. *Theophilus's*. In ancient classical names, use *'s* with every monosyllable, e.g. *Mars's*, *Zeus's*. Also with disyllables not in *-es*; as *Judas's*, *Marcus's*, *Venus's*. *Jesus's* is a well-known liturgical archaism. Ancient words in *-es* are usually written *-es'* in the possessive e.g. *Ceres's* rites, *Xerxes's* fleet. This applies only to *ancient* words. One writes *Moses's* law; and 'I used to alight at *Moses's* for the British Museum'. — *Inn-Public house*: An *inn* is defined as "a *public house* kept for the lodging and entertainment of travellers or any who wish to use its accommodation; a *hostelry* or *hotel*; sometimes erroneously a *tavern* which does not provide lodging" (N.E.D.). — *Town council* or *City Council* could not be said of a village. Dover *Town Council* have decided to make the following house allowances to the police.... (Times, Feb. 27. 1920.). The *City Council* voted to spend twice the original amount (Cassell's *Magaz.*, Sept. 1903, p. 385.) The most conservative members of the *City Council* of Ghent (Century Magazine, Oct. 1906, p. 825.). *Parish council*: Historically a *parish* denotes a circumscribed territory varying in extent and population but annexed to a single church whose incumbent is entitled to the tithes. Originally this *ecclesiastical parish* and the *civil parish* were one and the same thing but at the present day there are in England and Wales nearly 15000 civil parishes and 14000 ecclesiastical parishes, and in only one third of these do the civil and the ecclesiastical boundaries coincide. Every *parish* with a population of 300 or more has a *parish council*. Every Englishman is, theoretically, a native of some parish, and the difficulty as to a person born on the high seas was solved by considering him a 'Parishioner of Stepney'.

18. *Something which*. As a rule *that* is the relative found after *thing* and compounds of *thing*, and after the substantives *little* and *much*. The occupant was doing, at the window, *something which* showed him that he might knock. (H. James: *Owen Wingrave*.). More and more certain that something was being kept from her — *something which* concerned the Honourable Herbert pretty closely. (Sapper: *The Man in Ratcatcher* p. 128.).

19. *Come out of his house*. — *They had seem Walter leaving his house*. — The whole action is viewed, as appears from the rest of the sentence, the aspect is therefore perfective rather than durative: The young man I saw leave Mr. Adams's house. (A. K. Green: *The Circular Study* Ch. XI.). See Handbook § 703—707.

20. *Next Sunday*. Poutsma II. 451: "*Next* is now chiefly used in indicating proximity as to order or rank or as to time. When denoting proximity as to time it is used with regard to the moment of speaking or writing, or to some moment in the past. In the former case the article is almost regularly dropped, in the latter it is more commonly retained. *The next* morning at a time

when ... (Opening sentence of Chapter X of Hardy's *Return of the Native*). We should expect the def. article in the following quotation from *The Times* (26. 12. 1919): On his arrival (at school) the book was instantly confiscated by the matron, and *next morning* he was told by the headmaster that if he had not been a new boy he would have been flogged. — *The next Sunday* Susan was busy preparing two rooms for Mr. Eden. (Reade: *It is Never too Late to Mend*). — *Congregation* — *Community*. "The most estimable member of my *community*" replied the minister, "and the wealthiest." (Maarten Maartens: *Brothers All* p. 158.). The Dutch *community* of the reformed religion in London subscribed 9000 florins (Motley I. III. 77.). The most common modern sense of *congregation* according to N. E. D. is 'a body of persons assembled for religious worship or to hear a preacher'. The church going bells ... calling the *prim congregation* to morning prayer. (Kingleake: *Eothen*). With the meaning of 'body of persons who habitually attend or belong to a particular place of worship': Escaping to the continent on the accession of Mary Tudor John Knox finally settled for some years as minister of the English *congregation* at Geneva. (Balfour: "Presbyterianism" in *Cambridge Manuals*). — *With (the) consent of*. He levied taxes and imposts quite regardless of the Great Charter which he had ratified and which forbade him to do so *without consent of* Parliament. (Popular Educator p. 272.). The County Council may establish a Parish Council in a parish with a population of less than 100, but only *with the consent* of the Parish Meeting. (Jack's Reference Book p. 448.).

Good translations were received from Miss J. B., Eindhoven; Mr. H. B., The Hague; Miss A. E. S., Enschedé; Miss A. H., Flushing; Miss A. H., Amsterdam; Mr. J. H., Utrecht; Mr. H. J., Uden; Miss M. K., Zetten; Mr. H. v. L., Twijzelerheide; Mr. M. G. v. L., Helder; Miss T. v. M., 's Hertogenbosch; Mr. A. T. de M., Amsterdam; Mr. A. P. M., Barneveld; Miss M. P., Utrecht; Mr. J. B. P., Rotterdam; Mr. M. R., Rauwerd; Sr. Ph. Oirschot; Mr. K. d. V., Dokkum; Mr. J. V., Rotterdam; Miss C. v. d. W., Breda.

Translations of the following text should be sent to P. J. H. O. Schut, 94 Voorstraat, Brielle, before December 20. They will be returned with corrections if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

1. Axel had in de laatste dagen het land rondgereden als een opkooper, die eieren en hoenders zocht; bij elke deur had hij aangeklopt als een voddennjood; hij had hulp gevraagd bij kooplieden, hij had geklaagd bij oude vrienden, die hij bij de wedrennen had leeren kennen en die hem zijn geld hadden afgewonnen; niemand was thuis en de weinigen, die hij toevallig ontmoette, hadden hun beurs thuis gelaten. 2. Zoolang we ons in de wereld ruim kunnen bewegen, hebben we vele vrienden, doch wanneer onze ellebogen een weinig door de mouwen beginnen te komen dan is dat den vrienden te genegeerd. 3. Dit moest Axel bitter, bitter ervaren. 4. Hij was in stilte, zonder dat zijn zusters het wisten naar Schwerin gegaan; hij was naar de joden geweest, die toen ter tijde zoo prettig zaken met hem gedaan hadden; maar waar waren de hypotheek-brieven? 5. Hij was zelfs naar zijn zwager Breitenburg gereden, met wien hij altijd slecht overweg had gekund, hij had de koele ontvangst verdragen, en hem zijn verschrikkelijken toestand blootgelegd, maar hem niets van het geld zijner zusters gezegd; deze had hem echter strak in de oogen gekeken, hem den rug toegekeerd en gezegd: „Tu l'as voulu, Georges Dandin! 6. En in de put waarin uw geld verdwenen is, wilt gij dat ik mijn geld zal werpen? 7. Mijn geld, dat ik onder ontbering en zorg verdiend heb? 8. Want uw zuster heeft mij immers niets aangebracht. 9. En waar zijn de vijftien duizend daalders, die gij uw zusters afgetroggeld hebt?” 10. Dat sloeg hem ter neer — zijn zwager wist dat dus — doodsbleek wankelde hij de deur uit en steeg in zijn rijtuig. 11. Hij reed dus naar huis en ging met loodzwaren tred naar zijn kamer; het was klaar dag en hij zag, dat in zijn kamer nog alles was, zooals het geweest was. 12. Maar zijn hart was anders, verstand en hart waren anders geworden.



13. Hij maakte het raam open, opdat de frissche morgenlucht hem het brandende voorhoofd zou afkoelen, liet zich in den leuningstoel voor zijn schrijftafel neervallen en klemde het hoofd tusschen beide handen. 15. Toen vielen zijn oogen op een brief; de hand was hem welbekend; hij had ze vele malen eerder gezien. 15. Hij scheurde den brief open: ja, hij was van zijn zuster. 16. Wat had zijn zwager Breitenburg ook weer tot hem gezegd? 17. Ja, dat was het! 18. Hij keek uit het raam en zag achter het dennenbosch de zon opgaan en voor hem het korenveld liggen. 19. O, als dat maar rijp was en gedorscht, en het had twintigvoudig vrucht gedragen, ja, dan — neen, neen, dan kon het hem nog niet helpen.

## Reviews.

*The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet.* By B. A. P. VAN DAM, M. D.  
John Lane, London. 1924. pp. viii. 380.

Dr. van Dam's monograph on the text of *Hamlet* must contain, in addition to the play, nearly a hundred thousand words: it is crowded with detail and is throughout laboriously argumentative. To review it thoroughly would require another monograph of almost equal length, and the time to write it. I must do the best I can in a reasonable space.

Dr. van Dam's first and longest chapter deals with the 'stolne and surreptitious' quarto printed in 1603, which he calls QS, denoting the good quarto of the following year by Q. At the end of the chapter he sums up his conclusions as to the character and origin of QS as follows:

"The QS. represents the drama as it was acted, taken down from the players' mouths. The genuine copy of the play was to a great extent curtailed, and in some cases altered, for the sake of the performance. All minor and vital changes by which the QS is distinguished from the Q are, apart from printers' and reporters' mistakes, satisfactorily explained by such curtailment, by such alteration, and by the mistakes made by the actors in reciting their parts.

This presentation of things is in keeping with the opinion of those who have pleaded in favour of the unity of QS and Q. But it differs from every former hypothesis by the supposition that the mistakes of the actors have largely contributed to the smaller and greater differences between the QS and the Q.

The supposition as to the alterations made for the sake of the theatrical representation is the reverse of the first sketch hypothesis. The QS was not rewritten into the Q, but in a few places the Q was rewritten into the QS."

Dr. van Dam's first approach to this subject is by an extremely able and clear-sighted analysis of the kinds of mistakes that can with certainty be attributed, not to the printer, but to the scribe, or to the stenographer, or to the actor. He exhibits most ingeniously the scribe making precisely the same mistakes as are mostly regarded as characteristic 'printer's errors'; he also shows that mistakes claimed as necessarily those of the stenographer might equally well have been made by a printer. But in the case of the actor he points out that, unlike the scribe and the printer, "he has the whole part in his memory, he knows what is coming both in his own part and in the parts of his fellow-actors", and that thus every now and then actors may make mistakes of anticipation impossible to their fellow sinners. Thus in QS. 113 the line which should have been printed:

And then it started like a guilty thing

appears with 'faded' instead of 'started'. Nine lines further on we come to:

It faded on the crowing of the cock.

An actor would have this later line in his memory, and might thus make an anticipatory use of 'faded' in line 113, whereas neither a printer nor a transcriber could make this error. Thus Dr. van Dam would be quite justified in claiming that even a few such mistakes suffice to show that the passages in which they occur were "taken down directly from the lips of the actors." Unfortunately he makes two extensions of this deduction neither of which is logically legitimate, assuming (i) that when the words were taken down from the lips of actors they were taken down by a stenographer from the text spoken on the stage, and (ii) that because certain passages were taken down from the lips of the actors therefore the QS. may be regarded as wholly derived in this way, to the exclusion of any rival theory that it was printed from a stage-manuscript. There is no reason why the words should not have been taken down just as well at a tavern as in a playhouse, and if the actor happened to be in possession of one or more player's parts, the fact that for the rest of the play he was reciting from memory need not have prevented him from using his 'parts', or even fragments of a stage copy, if he had any.

The great weakness of this section of Dr. van Dam's case is that he is obliged to attribute to the Chamberlain's men, soon to be the King's Players, at the Globe, a slovenliness which not even his pretty plea as to accuracy being a modern ideal makes it easy to regard as possible. As long as the belief in the play having been taken down in shorthand held the field the origin of the surreptitious quarto was necessarily located in London, as only in London would writers of shorthand abound. But the first mention of this method of pirating plays is later than 1603 and there is no obligation to call in a stenographer for the *Hamlet* QS.

Now though Dr. van Dam in this monograph has rendered excellent service by demonstrating that parts of the QS. must have been 'taken down from the lips of actors', his 'supposition that the mistakes of the actors' must have 'largely contributed to the smaller and greater differences between the QS. and the Q' is not quite so original as he claims. Ever since 1910, when Dr. Greg in editing the pirated quarto of the *Merry Wives of Windsor* suggested that the actor who played the Host of the Garter must have helped in producing that text, English students have thought much more of the old suggestion that the actor or actors who played Marcellus and Voltendand in *Hamlet* may have had a share in producing the QS. of 1603. In 1918 Professor Dover Wilson elaborated this theory in his articles on 'The copy for *Hamlet*' in *The Library*, and in 1919 in the same periodical Dr. Greg, in an article entitled "Bad Quartos outside Shakespeare — *Alcazar* and *Orlando*," pointed out that the defects in the 1594 quarto of Greene's *Orlando Furioso* may best be explained by "imperfect memorization" and "memorial reconstruction" on the part of actors, and connected this theory with the problem of the four piracies of plays by Shakespeare. In 1923 Dr. Greg restated his theory in his *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press), and in the same year Mr. Crompton Rhodes in his study of *Shakespeare's First Folio* (Oxford, Blackwell) propounded a 'simple explanation' of the pirated quartos as prompt-books prepared by an actor in the Chamberlain's company by dictating to a confederate what he could remember of the plays and making use also of his 'parts'. Dr. Greg suggests that not one actor but several collaborated

in the 'memorial reconstruction' of Orlando, and attributes their efforts to the need of adding to their repertory when on tour in the provinces, a much more likely inducement than the small sum a publisher would be willing to pay for such poor texts. It seems to me that the good work which Dr. van Dam has put into his opening chapter lends much more support to some theory on these lines than to his own (improved) revival of the old hypothesis of a stenographer taking notes at the Globe. One remark of his seems peculiarly apposite, that on page 63 where he says 'The written text seems to have sometimes been not much more than a kind of guide-book.' That Shakespeare's text was used for no more than this by Burbage and his fellows at the Globe is surely incredible, but to actors used to vamping in the provinces the worst scenes in the QS. would serve as useful notes, and if the piracy was in the first instance only put together for this purpose we can understand why no pains were taken to make it better.

Before passing from this we must note an interesting suggestion by Dr. van Dam, that the QS., while omitting part of the soliloquy of Claudius (III.iii.) when he attempts to pray, preserves a dozen lines which have been omitted both in the good quarto and the Folio. There is a great advantage in having a third text, even though it be a bad one. In Lear III.i. the Quarto omits lines 22—29, and the Folio lines 30—42, and if a third text survived we should probably find that Q and F in their weariness of the good Kent's speeches had in some instances both curtailed them in the same way. Dr. van Dam's suggestion is thus very attractive. It must be said, however, that 'white as snowe' comes in both sections of the speech of Claudius, and it remains possible that these are alternatives.

In his second chapter Dr. van Dam considers what he regards as the interpolations in the quarto of 1604 (Q) and the Folio. He lays down the rule that "insertions by a strange hand in the work of a great poet are rendered conspicuous by more or less characteristic peculiarities: they are redundant, they break the metre, they are inferior, and what is no less important — they suit some purpose", for instance they help actors to make their exit ('pray you goe with me', etc.), or are natural salutations ('welcome good Marcellus'), or supply words to accompany an actor's movements (Ophelia's 'there, my lord' when she returns Hamlet's gifts), or again are explanatory (Hamlet's 'my vnkle' regarded as explaining 'the serpent that did sting thy father's life Now weares his crowne') or they make a conversation less abrupt. After considering in much detail in his next two chapters the formal and verbal variations between the Q and the F and the original text, and the omissions in the Q and F, Dr. van Dam asks "what is the Q and what is the F" and summarizes his own conclusions by saying: —

"There are printers' mistakes which the QS. and the Q have in common, so that the Q is partly a reprint of the QS. For the rest there are reasons that make it probable that the Q was printed from Shakespeare's autograph, which had been adapted for the stage.

There are printers' mistakes which the Q and the F have in common, so that the F is partly a reprint of the Q. For the rest the F was printed from a prompt-copy older than the Q or from a transcript of that prompt-copy."

Dr. van Dam quotes in justification of his belief that the Q was printed from Shakespeare's autograph (i) uncommon phonetic spellings, as 'deale' (for 'devil') and 'warn't' (for 'warrant'); (ii) the occurrence of different *præfixa* for the same person, *Claudius* or *King*, *Queen* or *Gertrard*, *Courtier* or *Ostricke*, (iii) the stage direction '*Enter old Polonius, with his man or two*'.



Of course an obsequious scribe might have reproduced these peculiarities in a transcript; but there is no reason for dragging in obsequious scribes, and the three points are all good. That the autograph had been 'adapted for the stage' is a much more disputable proposition. There is no reason for accepting it unless Dr. van Dam's views as to actors' interpolations are previously accepted, and treated as the basis for this further argument. In like manner the statements that the Q is partly a reprint of the QS. and that the Folio is partly a reprint of the Q, seem to need careful examination. That to some extent the F was printed from a prompt-copy (or transcript from it) is certain; but again the priority which Dr. van Dam claims for this prompt-copy over the Q is not lightly to be admitted, unless Dr. van Dam's views as to actors' interpolations are accepted *en bloc*.

Chapters vi and vii deal with Shakespeare's Prosody, and the relation in his plays between rhyme, blank verse, broken verse and prose. The earlier of the two chapters starts with Theobald's note on Hamlet li.37. ("Had made his course t'illumine that part of heaven") in which that eminent critic defended his proposal to read 't'illumine' with the remark that "too nice a regard must not be had to the numbers of Shakespeare: nor needs the Redundance of a *Syllable* here be any objection; for nothing is more usual with our Poet than to make a Dactyl, or allow a supernumerary *Syllable* which is sunk and melted in the pronunciation." To Dr. van Dam this remark of Theobald's marks the beginning of a wholly wrong theory of Shakespeare's prosody, which has so obsessed all English critics and commentators that they become merely abusive when any one, more especially Dr. van Dam himself, tries to convince them that the fact that a given way of reading a line of Shakespeare's blank verse sounds entirely satisfactory to our modern ears does not prove either that Shakespeare wrote the line in this form, or that (if he wrote it in this form) he intended that it should be read in this way. Quite rightly Dr. van Dam insists that before we can dogmatize as to how Shakespeare intended a line of his verse to be read we must enquire and learn how all the words in the line were pronounced in Shakespeare's days, and he shows that some words were, or might be, pronounced with more syllables than we should now give them, and many other words with fewer syllables. The distinction between "were pronounced", and "might be pronounced" is important, but for a fair discussion it is necessary to admit (taking the simplest possible example) that there was nothing more monstrous in an Elizabethan Englishman saying 'th'effect' with a total elision of the 'e' in 'the' than in a Frenchman saying 'l'effet' with a total elision of the 'e' in 'le'. The most we can plead in diminution of this necessity is to stress the fact that whereas in French the elision is compulsory, in Elizabethan English it was clearly only optional. Here, however, Dr. van Dam interposes with quotations to show that according to the assertions of fairly contemporary poets and critics the only legitimate addition to the ten syllables of an English blank verse is a light extra syllable at the end, and however easy and pleasant it is for us to read 'the effect' without injuring the rhythm of the line, if it would add a syllable too many to the verse, the 'e' must have been totally elided, when it was read in Shakespeare's day. In the same way he argues that the extra syllable sometimes found after the 'break' in a line must be an interpolation; also that Shakespeare never left any uncompleted lines, and in dialogue where a line is shared between two or more speakers never treated this division as a reason for using additional syllables. By the aid of his elaborate theory of interpolations by actors set forth in Chapter ii Dr. van Dam

succeeds in ridding the lines of any syllables which he cannot render silent by evidence of pronunciation and still finds redundant. He is equally drastic in dealing with uncompleted lines, and resorts to violent rearrangement to get rid of them. After a time the most patient reader will find it difficult to avoid experiencing a reaction against these methods. There are too many lines to be altered, and we feel that if Shakespeare did not keep to his ten syllables, Dr. van Dam is prepared to make him, no matter what it costs. The war waged against the extra syllable after the break in the line is particularly productive of bad results. Thus *I.ii.160*.

Hora. Haile to your Lordship

Ham.

*I am glad to see you well!*

becomes curiously American when *I am* is omitted.

Facing this at *I.ii.198-99* we have the lines:

In the dead wast and middle of the night

Beene thus incountred, a figure like your father . . .

These, to get rid of the extra syllable in the second line, Dr. van Dam would print:

In the dead wast and mid of night beene thus

Incount[er]red, a figure like your father . . .

where the second line is deplorable. The fact that an extra syllable was permitted at the end of a line makes it reasonable that a similar licence should be permitted after the break; and the instances are so numerous, and the temptation to actors to interfere in such matters so slight, that these repeated attacks on the Quarto text seem unreasonable. Dr. van Dam has indeed to meet a double difficulty: if the actors were moved to emend Shakespeare's verses the theory that a blank verse could not have more than ten syllables must have been lightly held at least by some of those whose business it was to say the lines. On the other hand when Bysshe and other critics declared that no more than ten syllables were allowable, they had hundreds of lines of Shakespeare contradicting them in the Folios, and if they could make their assertions in the teeth of these lines, the lines may very well stay as they are in the teeth of their assertions. It would be easy to quote similar instances of the unreasonable excision of uncompleted lines. Of these again there are too many for a general attack on them to succeed, and the structure of Shakespeare's verse at this period, when sentences so frequently ended and began within the line, makes their appearance easily intelligible.

Dr. van Dam will be quite within his right if he tells me that a bibliographer has no qualification, as such, to deal with these high questions. I cheerfully admit it. But I gather that it is these alleged tamperings with the text as Shakespeare wrote it which cause him to assert that the Quarto of 1604 had been "adapted for the stage" and I do not think that they afford any adequate ground for the assertion. But whether one agrees with Dr. van Dam or not, he is always ingenious as well as painstaking, and I know no other book on the text of Hamlet which raises so many interesting points.

A. W. POLLARD.

*De Engelsche Literatuur sinds 1880*, by A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.  
18 × 12 c.M., pp. 143. Uitgevers-Maatschappij „Elsevier”, Amsterdam.  
1924. Price f 1.40; geb. f 1.90.

It is gratifying to note that the first book in which the history of modern English literature is brought right up to date was written by a Dutchman

and published in Holland. And let me add straight away that no one in Holland could have undertaken this task better than Mr. van Kranendonk. He possesses the very qualities that are required for writing a book of this sort, he is widely read, his taste is unerring, his judgment sound, and he is as moderate in the expression of his views as he is guarded in his conclusions.

The masterly manner of mapping out the field of modern literature in the first ten pages gives the reader full assurance of the confidence with which he may accept the services of his guide. Although the author modestly disclaims any great value for his group-division, the neat arrangement of his matter in the subsequent pages shows that the lines of demarcation have been judiciously drawn.

Proportions, always a difficult matter in a book of limited dimensions, have been carefully observed, and on thorough investigation, I have found that not one really important error of omission has been made. It is pleasing to see the names of such world-famous writers as Hall Caine, Marie Corelli and A. S. M. Hutchinson excluded, and delightful to find the author quietly refusing to defend this exclusion.

I really could not say which of the three main divisions, poetry, the novel or the drama has been most competently dealt with, because they are all equally well done. Among the best pages of the book are those on Conrad, Kipling, Hardy and "Barbellion." I will quote — for the benefit of non-Dutch readers in English — what Mr. van Kranendonk says about the poets of to-day in general.

"The works of present-day poets appeal to larger and much more heterogeneously composed groups of readers than those of their predecessors, not because they write more simply, superficially and popularly, but because their view of life has become wider, and their attitude more tolerant. Very few of them are still vehemently sure of the infallibility of some art-formula or other, or of some religious, philosophical or political system. Some combine within themselves tendencies, views and ideals which used to be found in different individuals only. Nearly all are too conscious of the complexity of life to join with intense conviction any definite school of thought, to testify passionately to the truth and glory of any exclusive faith, to seek salvation in one single rigorous theory of art. In so far they are, without loss to their distinctive individual personality, more inter-related than their immediate predecessors."

I also cannot withstand the temptation to transcribe the following passage on Kipling, on account of the ironical light which it throws on English imperialism in literature.

"Though Rudyard Kipling still belongs to the most widely read authors, his popularity culminated in the last years of the nineteenth century. Then he was looked upon not only as a talented poet and a master of the short story, but thousands saw in him a great and inspired prophet. His teaching appealed particularly to the middle classes. The message which he brought was easily understood and did not differ much from that of the average imperialist politician. He did not touch on problems that required laborious thought, he respected established religious conviction, glorified strength and energy and raised chauvinism, the fighting instinct and sound commercialism to the level of lofty virtues. He incited the people to comradeship, co-operation and the spirit of sacrifice, but the ideal to which all those virtues were subordinated, was not the well-being of mankind in general, but the strengthening and expansion of the British Empire. To contribute to the



proud imperial structure according to one's ability was the duty and the privilege of every Englishman, and stern discipline and obedience to the law were in the first place demanded for that.... Nearly all phenomena of life are ultimately seen in their bearing upon this high and holy purpose, the promotion of England's power and greatness. In Kipling's work we find but little attention bestowed on love; love often seems but a temporary folly which keeps man from doing his duty. Dreamers and philosophers provoke his supreme contempt: the State has no use for their meditations. In the character of the fine, pugnacious boys in *Stalky and Co* he discovers with satisfaction the germs of qualities that will afterwards make them into heroic defenders of the Empire.... His stories about animals are sometimes symbolical, also in the jungle it pays to form large, co-operative groups and to submit to the law. With indignation the animals refer to the arrogant, loquacious, dreamy monkey-tribe, who will not organize and therefore cannot exert power.... Only men of action rouse his admiration, statesmen, engineers, seamen and especially officers and soldiers. He is not at all blind to their shortcomings and in his tales of Anglo-Indian life he does not spare his compatriots. But his satire always condones, the vices he censures are only the temporary vices of men who are at bottom brave and honest, the defects are only those of an excellent system. He seems to anticipate that everything will come right in the end, for those whom he sees erring are Englishmen and the superior qualities of the race will finally with God's help assert themselves again."

It is unavoidable in a book of this kind that the author's personal opinion should on occasion have to be left unsupported by argument. But the quietly authoritative, and unemphatic manner in which such opinions are given, coupled with the ever-present evidence of good taste, often makes us accept them unchallenged.

Yet in some cases the reader is bound to quarrel with the author. So am I, for one, of opinion that Mr. van Kranendonk underrates the value of Barrie's work, and does insufficient justice to this writer's rich and original powers of fancy and imagination. Also I do not think that in *The Forsyte Saga* Mr. Galsworthy levels a sharp attack at the prevalent spirit amongst the upper middle classes. He loves the beautiful traits in the typical Forsyte character far too much to do any such thing. My objections to Mr. van Kranendonk's views on Shaw I shall state in another issue.

The book is rather carelessly printed and edited. Three pages on Meredith should at least have been introduced by a new paragraph. Mac Sinclair (p. 128) is a misprint, so probably is George Dumaurier, although the Index gives the same spelling. The editor of *The Adelphi* is J. Middleton (not M.) Murry. I also made a note of the spellings *wijfelen*, *exentriek* and *precisieeren*. When I see the author writing 'tegen het einde komt er een droef-berustenden wijsgeerigen toon in het boek' (p. 106), I am reminded of a certain book, also published in Holland, which professed to unravel the intricacies of syntax for the reader, and yet confronted the eye on the second page with 'er wordt een geweldigen storm beschreven.' When the consciousness of case-differences is evidently dying out or dead in those who handle a language in writing, it would appear desirable to knock the specific endings off its inflectional corpses, both as a matter of prudence and of seemliness.

This book should be translated and published in England.

London.

J. KOOISTPA.

### Brief Mentions.

*Shakespeare Grammatik.* Von W. FRANZ. Dritte verbesserte auflage. Heidelberg. 1924. Carl Winter. 640 pp. geb. 17 M.

Professor Franz's Shakespeare grammar is one of those books that it would be impertinent, especially in a younger scholar, to criticize. It is the standard work on the subject, and is likely to remain so for many years to come. The new edition is a reprint of the second, but in an Appendix the author has conscientiously collected all the improvements that have been made possible by his own study and by the work of other, chiefly German, scholars. It must be confessed that it does not amount to much. The publisher is perhaps able to supply the possessors of the second edition with an offprint of the Appendix; no one, at any rate, is likely to buy the third if he possesses the second edition. I have no details to add to the text, but may state my conviction that a further and more minute study of present English will show several differences between the language of Shakespeare and the language of the present day that are not noticed in the work at present. For one thing, the use of the non-finite verb was far more restricted in Shakespeare's time. No example can probably be adduced corresponding to such accusatives with infinitives as *I hate you to go there*; or prepositional acc. cum inf. as *Molly could not imagine how she had at one time wished for her father's eyes to be opened*. The difference between *He asked her to stay there* and *He asked for her to stay there a little longer* could be expressed in Shakespeare's time only by using a subordinate clause in the second case. The use of some gerundial constructions, too, is an innovation of modern English. The nominative with infinitive and the use of the passive infinitive are also different in the two periods. — K.

---

*Herrick's Poetical Works.* With a prefatory note by PERCY SIMPSON. Oxford University Press, 1921, vii + 446 pp. 5 sh. net.

This edition, containing: 'Hesperides', 'His Noble Numbers' and 'Additional Poems', differs from the larger one published by the Clarendon Press under the editorship of the late Professor Moorman, in two points: it confines itself to the text of 1648 noting only the variants of that issue and it omits almost entirely the Epigrams of the Hesperides — which are indeed of little value except for the specialist. The publishers have thus made Herrick's beautiful work more easily accessible to the lover of poetry. The book is very carefully printed and provided with an index of titles and one of first lines. — A. G. v. K.

---

MARY SHELLEY: *Proserpine, Midas*. Two unpublished mythological dramas. Edited by A. KOSZUL. London 1922. Humphrey Milford.

These small and unpretentious dramatic compositions of Mary Shelley were issued by A. Koszul on the occasion of the Shelley Centenary. They testify to the close collaboration of the couple and prove in addition that, contrary to Godwin's verdict, Mary Shelley was after all possessed of some small dramatic talent. In the editor's estimation these productions rank above her novels *Frankenstein* and *Valperga*. They remained hitherto unpublished and should, according to Medwin, be assigned to the year 1820. Their source is Ovid, whom, as we know, Mrs. Shelley was particularly recommended by her husband to read. In fact her fondness of Ovid was such that she would often recite from his work and even try her hand at poetical composition in a similar style. (E. Dowden, *Life of P. B. S.* I, 517). Perhaps we may assume that these experiments have suggested the composition of the two dramas or quite possibly even they may be regarded as a preliminary practice. To both pieces Shelley has contributed smaller lyrical poems.

Besides many useful literary references and explanations, Koszul's long and full Introduction contains the unfinished and so far unpublished draft of a treatise on the *Necessity of a Belief in the Heathen Mythology to a Christian*, rather preposterous stuff indeed, but interesting nevertheless as additional evidence of the attitude of the Shelleys towards the fundamental principles of religion.

Bochum.

F. ASANGER.



*Moderne Amerikaansche Letterkunde. Edith Wharton. Door J. H. KLOOSTER. Diss. Groningen, 1924. 22 $\frac{1}{2}$  × 16 c.M. Pp. 166.*

Miss Klooster has examined 1o Edith Wharton's significance as an author, 2o her relation to European literature, 3o the conclusions to be drawn from her works with reference to the position of women in American society. She has divided her book into an Introduction and five chapters: Historic survey; Mrs. Wharton as a short story writer; Novels and Novelettes; Books of Travel and other Work; Conclusion.

It appears that of late English and American literature have occasionally attracted students of Dutch in search of a subject for a dissertation. Dr. Halberstadt's on Dutch imitations of Thomson's *Seasons* is another example. We should be sorry, however, for there to be many more theses, either by students of Dutch or of English, in a similar vein to the present one. Miss Klooster indeed almost disarms criticism by her utter lack of pretension, and by a number of shrewd remarks which season her narrative. But it may be wondered, for all that, whether a volume consisting mainly of a series of summaries alternating with extracts from reviews, constitutes an addition to learning worthy of the doctor's degree. — Z.

*The Oxford English Dictionary. Volume X. Unforeseeing-Unright. By W. A. CRAIGIE. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1924. 10s. net.*

The instalments of the famous Oxford Dictionary do not succeed each other with the clockwork regularity to which we had become accustomed before the war. At the present rate of progress it will take many years before the small gap that is left will be filled up. But one result of the change is that we have more time to examine each new part as it appears before putting it into our bookcase. The present instalment is not rich in interesting words. Five sixths of the 128 pages are occupied by words formed with one or other of the two prefixes *un-*. They illustrate among other things the history of the relation of the negative suffixes *un-* and *in-*. Of special interest to the grammarian is the article on *unless*, even though the earliest quotation is identical with the one given by Mätzner in his *Grammatik*. I have noticed one strange mistake: *unilateral* as a term in phonetics is defined as meaning 'uttered or produced with the glottis open on one side only'. It is clearly due to a misunderstanding of the quotation from Bell's *Visible Speech*: Uni-lateral formations. When the breath issues by only one side aperture in forming any 'divided' consonant, the modifier, etc. — Of course *side* refers to the tongue here, not to the glottis. — K.

*A Year's Work in English. By J. W. MARRIOTT. London, G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1921. 175 pp.*

The object of this interesting little book is to give material for thinking exercises, opportunities for self-expression and imaginary effort and introductions to great authors or masterpieces of literature. In the preface the author lays stress on the necessity of 'self-expression'; a zeal for reading is not enough, the pupil must be encouraged to write, to communicate his thoughts and the impressions made by the books he has read. In dealing with grammar, he has 'selected only those subjects which happen to be useful and fascinating' and always treated them in close connection with literature.

The series of exercises makes a somewhat chaotic impression; there is little coherence, the questions are very unequal in value and sometimes rather difficult even for the teacher. I confess that e.g. the following 'exercise in ingenuity and imagination' puzzled me: "Here are a few names for a well-known heavenly body: Latin: luna, German: der Mond, Greek: selene, Japanese: getsz, French: la lune, English: moon. Which word sounds yellowest? Which word looks coldest?"

But apart from such occasional excesses of originality, Mr. Marriott's book certainly deserves attention. It contains some helpful hints to the teacher of language, a mass of new material and exercises that will really interest the pupil and make him think and a great many admirable suggestions for class-reading. — A. G. v. K.



*A Grammar of Modern Dutch.* By E. KRUISINGA, Lecturer on English Philology for the Modern Language Association, The Hague. London. George Allen & Unwin. 1924. 5/— net. XII + 168 pp.

As no review of this book will naturally be published in this periodical, the writer may be allowed a *selbstanzeige*. It is intended in the first place for people of English speech who wish to learn Dutch. But if it is true what is held by most students of language, that the study of one's native tongue is a desirable preparation for the study of foreign languages, the book may be of practical use to students of English too. It treats of some peculiarities of Dutch that are seldom if ever treated in grammars written for Dutch readers, such as wordorder; it also, unavoidably, treats more familiar subjects from a different point of view. — E. K.

## Bibliography.

### PERIODICALS.

**Neophilologus.** X, 1. Oct. 1924. F. P. H. Prick van Wely, Kanttekeningen bij H. Poutsma's *Grammar of Late Modern English*, II, Section I, A: Nouns, Adjectives and Articles. I (pp. 31—36). — W. van Doorn, An enquiry into the causes of Swinburne's failure as a narrative poet. With special reference to the 'Tale of Balen'. I. (pp. 36-42). — W. Fischer. Über eine angebliche Quelle von Oscar Wilde's Erzählung *The Canterville Ghost* (pp. 42-49).

**Onze Eeuw.** Sept. 1924. Includes: *Deirdre* door William Butler Yeats, Metries vertaald door W. van Maanen. (193-216).

**Revue Anglo-Américaine.** II, 1. Oct. 1924. M. Castelain, Byron — en 1924. — M. Weill, Thackeray et la Société anglaise au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. — L. Wolff, Le sentiment médiéval en Angleterre au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, et la première poésie de William Morris (fin). — J. Malye, Les Mémoires de Wolfe Tone (fin).

**Revue de Littérature Comparée.** IV, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1924. Includes: P. Laumonier, Ronsard et l'Ecosse. — L. Cazamian, La psychanalyse et la critique littéraire. — Id. IV, 4. Oct.-Déc. 1924. Includes: Ch. Grimm, Encore une fois la question Marivaux-Richardson. — R. Messac, Caïn et le problème du mal dans Voltaire, Byron et Leconte de Lisle.

**The Journal of English and Germanic Philology.** XXIII, 3. July 1924. Includes: D. Bush, The classical tales in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*. — O. F. Emerson. The early literary life of Sir Walter Scott, III.

**Philological Quarterly.** III, 3. July 1924. Includes: E. N. S. Thompson, The interest of English poets in Italian freedom. — J. M. Berdahn, Marlowe's *Edward II*. — K. Malone, Granville Sharp (1767) on English pronunciation. — E. Colby, Thomas Holcroft: translator of plays. — J. S. Reid, Caesar's "Thrasonical brag". — Id. III, 4. Oct. 1924. Includes: E. F. Piper, The miniatures of the Ellesmere Chaucer. — R. C. Whitford, A little Lyttleton. — C. W. Nichols, Social satire in Fielding's *Pasquin* and *The Historical Register*.

**Modern Language Notes.** XXXIX, 7. Nov. 1924. Includes: A. W. Crawford, The Apparitions in *Macbeth*. Part. II. — H. H. Hudson, Grimald's translations from Beza. — O. K. Lundeborg, The true sources of Robert Dodsley's *The King and the Miller of Mansfield*. — J. M. Lindeman, A note on Cynewulf.

**Anglia.** XLVIII (N. F. XXXVI), 3. (Aug. 1924). Helene Richter, Byron. Klassizismus und Romantik. — Werner K. Rupprecht, Felicia Hemans und die englischen Beziehungen zur deutschen Literatur im ersten Drittel des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. III. — A. H. Smith, The Place-names Jervaulx, Ure, and York. — Id. XLVIII (N. F. XXXVI) 4. (Okt. 1924). Werner K. Rupprecht, Felicia Hemans und die englischen Beziehungen zur deutschen Literatur im ersten Drittel des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. IV. [End.]. — Karl Danz, Frances Burneys „Evelina" (1778) und das Aufkommen der Frauenromane. — Otto B. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur altengl. Wortforschung.



**Belblatt zur Anglia.** XXXV, 6 (Juni 1924). Reviews, including H. M. Flasdieck on Mia Schwarz, Alliteration im engl. Kulturleben neuerer Zeit. The same on W. F. Sedgfield, An Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book. — The same on Carleton Brown, A register of Middle English religious and didactic verse. — W. Fischer on Paul Meissner, Der Bauer in der engl. Lit. — The same on James Harrington's Oceana, ed. by S. B. Liljegren. — Herb. Huscher on Thomas Hardy, The famous Tragedy of the Queen of Cornwall at Tintagel in Lyonesse. — The same on Edw. D. Snyder, The Celtic Revival in English Literature 1760-1800. — Karl Luick, Zu ae. ongean. — **Id.** XXXV, 7. (Juli 1924). Reviews, including L. Masing on Josephine Calina, Shakespeare in Poland. — W. Fischer on S. B. Liljegren, The Fall of the Monasteries and the Social Changes in England up to the Great Revolution. — G. A. Dudok on Thomas Morus, Utopia, übers. v. G. Ritter. — Bernh. Fehr. on Harold Nicolson, Byron, The Last Journey. — Caro, on Poutsma, Inf. Ger., and Partic., and on Van der Laan, Progr. Form. — F. Liebermann: Ist Lambardes Text der Gesetze Æthelstans neuzeitliche Fälschung? — Hans Hecht: Zu Holthausers Bericht über v. Sydow, Beowulf och Bjärke. — **Id.** XXXV, 8. (Aug. 1924). Reviews, including E. Ekwall on Mittlengl. Originalurkunden von der Chaucerzeit bis zur Mitte des XV. Jhs. veröff. v. L. Morsbach. — The same on Jos. Wright and El. M. Wright, An Elementary Middle Engl. Grammar. — The same on Giessener Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache und Kultur Englands u. Nordamerikas hg. v. W. Horn. I. 1. — The same on James Wilson, The Dialect of Robert Burns as Spoken in Central Ayrshire. — S. B. Liljegren on G. C. Moore Smith, The Poems English and Latin of Edward Lord Herbert of Chisbury. — F. Holthausen: Zur englischen Wortkunde VII. — **Id.** XXXV, 9. (Sept. 1924). Reviews, including W. Krause on Jul. Pokorny, A historical Reader of Old Irish. — The same on Die älteste Lyrik der grünen Insel... Übertr. v. Jul. Pokorny. — The same on Die Seele Irlands. Novellen u. Gedichte... Übertr. v. Jul. Pokorny. — M. Friedwagner on Paul Studer, The Study of Anglo-Norman and Johan Vising, Anglo-Norman Language and Literature. — M. F. Mann on Catalogue of the Library of Sanki Ichikawa, P. 1. Engl. and Compar. Phil. — F. Mellin on W. F. Schirmer, Der englische Roman der Neuesten Zeit. — H. Mutschmann on Fred. C. Green, Rob. Fergussons Anteil an der Literatur Schottlands. — The same: Zur Frage des Albinismus Miltons. — F. Holthausen: Zu altengl. Dichtungen. — Joh. Ellinger on E. Kruisinga, An Engl. Grammar for Dutch Students. Vol. 1. — The same on Ph. Aronstein, Englische Stilistik. — Q. Mellin on Riemann-Eckermann, Engl. Unterrichtswerk. — The same on W. Viëtor u. F. Dörr, Engl. Lesebuch, Unterstufe. — The same on Teubners Kleine Auslandstexte für höhere Lehranstalten I, 1-4, 6, 7, 10-12. The same on Carl Riemann, Elementary English. — **Id.** XXXV, 10. (Okt. 1924). Reviews, including W. Fischer on Americana 1-9. — S. B. Liljegren on E. F. Hall, The Satirical Element in the American Novel. — The same on E. G. Sutcliffe, Emerson's Theories of Literary Expression. — Also an article: Hans Marcus, Die Entstehung von „Rule Britannia“ [Anf.].

**Englische Studien.** Generalregister zu Bd. 26-50, zusammengestellt von Albert Wagner. 8vo, 252 pp. Leipzig: Reisland, 1924.

**Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.** Jg. LXXIX, Bd 147. N.S. 47, 1/2. G. Heidemann, Die Flexion des Verb. subst. im Ags. — R. Marquardt, Experimentalphonetische Untersuch. zur Intonation im engl. Fragesatz.

**German.-Rom. Monatschrift.** XII, 7/8. Juli-Aug. 1924. Includes Phil. Aronstein, Der soziologische Charakter des engl. Renaissance-Dramas II. — Karl Arns, Edwin Arlington Robinson. — **Id.** XII, 9/10 (Sept.-Okt. 1924). Includes W. F. Schirmer, Boccaccios Werke als Quelle G. Chaucers. (Boccaccio's influence upon Chaucer is not nearly so intense as is generally believed).

**Die neueren Sprachen.** — XXXII, 3 (Juli-Sept. 1924). Includes Max Deutschbein, Preussische Schulreform und Neuere Sprachen. — Th. Zeiger, Die Neueren Fremdsprachen in der Neuordnung des Preussischen Höheren Schulwesens. [End; beginning see ibidem, 2, p. 155 ff. — Karl Breul, In memoriam Adolphus William Ward † June 19th, 1924]. — Ph. Aronstein, Englisch am Neusprachlichen gymnasium. — Max Schmid-Schmidfelden, Ein Österreichischer Lehrplan-Entwurf für Englisch als erste Fremdsprache. — The same: Das Schulprogramm der Englischen Arbeiterpartei. — Reviews, including M. Schmid-Schmidfelden on Helene Richter, Shakespeare der Mensch. — Berth. Cron on Wilh. Dibelius, England. — Fritz Karpf on W. F. Schirmer, Der englische Roman der Neuesten Zeit. — The same on E. Holmquist, On the History of the Engl. Present Inflections Parti-



cularly -th and -s. — The same on Otto Jespersen en Chr. Sarauw, Engelsch voor Eerstbeginnenden; A. Bernhard; Engl. Lesebuch.

**Zeitschrift für den franz. u. engl. Unterricht.** XXIII, 2 (1924). Includes K. Horn, William Rossétti: [II]. —

**Literaturblatt für germ. u. rom. Philologie.** XLV, 7/9 (Juli-Sept. 1924). Reviews, including F. Asanger on W. F. Schirmer, *Der englische Roman der Neuesten Zeit*. — Rich. Ackermann on Alfr. Steinitzer, *Shakespeares Königsdramen*.

**Neuphilologische Mitteilungen.** XXV, 4/8. (Okt. 1924). Includes Joh. Hoops, *Angelsächsisch blæd*. — J. V. Lehtonen, *Un passage de Shakespeare dans les „Récits de l'Enseigne Stål” de Runeberg*.

**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** N. F. I, 17 (Aug. 1924). Reviews, including H. Lüdecke on American poets. An anthology of contemporary verse by L. Speyer. — **Id.** N. F. I, 27 (Okt. 1924.) Includes Max Förster, *Boccaccios De casibus virorum illustrium in englischer Bearbeitung*. — G. Hübener, *Defoes Robinson Crusoe und dessen geschichte*. (Deals with Herm. Ullrich's recently published well-grounded book: *Defoes Robinson Crusoe*.) **Id.** N. F. I, 30. (Nov. 1924.) Reviews including an article by Friedr. Brie on Alfred W. Pollard, W. W. Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson and R. W. Chambers: *Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More*.

**Die Literatur.** Formerly: *Das literarische Echo*. XXVI, 11 (Aug. 1924.) Includes A. Busse, *Amerikanischer Brief*. — **Id.** XXVII, 1 (Okt. 1924.) Includes Ph. Aronstein, *Das englische Renaissancedrama*. (Deals with E. K. Chambers' important work in four volumes: *The Elizabethan Stage*. Oxford, 1923). — Werner Weisbach, *Eine Shakespeare-Reform aus dem Geiste des Barock*. — **Id.** XXVII, 2 (Nov. 1924). Includes Werner Mahrholz on Herm. Ullrich, *Defoes Robinson Crusoe*. *Die geschichte eines Weltbuches*.

**Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte.** II, 2 (1924). Includes G. Hübener, *Neue Anglistik und ihre Methoden*.

**Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft.** N. F. I. (Der ganzen Reihe LIX/LX). (1924). Eleonore v. Bojanowski, Die erste Protektorin der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Grossherzogin Sophie, und ihr Enkel, Grossherzog Wilhelm Ernst von Sachsen. — William Ellery Leonard, Sonette auf das Ich William Shakespeare's. Uebers. v. Ernst Feise-Mexiko. — Heinrich Lilienfein, Shakespeare's dichterische Phantasie. Festvortrag. — Georg Hartmann, Die Bühnengesten in Shakespeare's Dramen als Ausdruck von Gemütsbewegungen. — Karl Ege, Der Anteil Shakespeare's an „The two Noble Kinsmen”. — Elisabeth Schaefer, zur Datierung von Shakespeare's „All's Well That Ends Well”. — Arnold S. Berger, zur Technik des „Hamlet”. — Wolfgang Keller, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson und die Folio van 1623. — Emil Wolff, Die sogenannte Shakespeare-Bacon-Frage. — Otto Francke, Zum Heimgehe der Brüder Dr. Wilhelm u. Geh. Rat Professor Dr. Adolf v. Oechelhäuser. — Alois Brandl, Rudolf Fischer. — Hans Lindau, Hans Daffis. — Bücherschau I: Wolfgang Keller, Sammelreferat; II: Einzelreferate von J. Schick, Eugen Kilian, Oscar Fritz Schuh, Otto Francke. — Wolfgang Keller u. Cläre Hunekuhl, Zeitschriftenschau. — Theaterschau von Monty Jacobs, Otto Francke, Helene Richter, Eugen Kilian, Karl Arns. — Egon Mühlbach, Statistischer Überblick über die Aufführungen Shakespeare'scher Werke auf d. dt. u. einigen ausserdt. Bühnen in d. Jahren 1922 u. 1923. — Eduard Hartl, Shakespeare-Bibliographie.

---

**English Studies at Groningen.** Dr. P. Harting, Reader in Dutch Language and Literature at University College, London, has been appointed Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Groningen.